

January 22, 2016

To Whom It May Concern:

Please consider the following comments regarding election rules to be implemented in 2016:

Rules I like:

2.14.5

4.1.3

4.8.6

6.1.5

6.2.2

6.4.1 I appreciate the change **that with written consent by each major party chair** a county with more than 5,000 can use regular staff. This makes way more since.

7.1.2

7.8.2

7.8.6

7.8.14

7.8.15

8.1

8.1.1

8.1.2

8.1.3

8.1.4

8.7.1

8.7.2

8.7.4

8.10.2

8.15.3

8.15.6

8.15.7

8.15.8

8.15.9

8.15.10

Rules I don't like and why:

6.1.1 This is in conflict with C.R.S 1-6-102 (1) 1-6-104 and 1-6-103; an election judge shall serve for a two year period and the political party in even numbered years and the list shall be provided "after the precinct caucus in even-numbered year..." We are required to use the caucus list, which can only be gathered at caucus.

RECOMMEND: This rule to be struck.

6.1.2 There is no requirement in C.R.S that we request an additional list or a requirement to use it. Suggestion would be that if you run out of judges to use and you need additional judges to have equal representation then we should contact the parties for a list of additional but if not we just move forward with what was given to us at the caucus. If not we recommend this rule be struck.

RECOMMEND: This rule to be struck.

6.1.3, 6.1.4 by the 60th day most of us have already contacted judges and have them assigned again I feel this is in conflict with C.R.S 1-6-104 and 1-6-103. This would be problematic to provide a list at this time that would not be complete as we are sometimes updating and filling holes up until election day for one reason or another.

RECOMMEND: This rule to be struck.

6.2.1 Party chairs do not understand the duties assigned to judges so why would we allow them to designate signature judges? We already know the capability of what our judges are capable of doing. We were elected by our citizens to run elections with integrity and now you are trying to remove us from this process of doing our jobs. Our party chairs say we know who will work best for what role in the election process and they don't want to pick any judge roles because most of the time they don't even know the people.

RECOMMEND: This rule to be struck.

6.3. I understand the Clerk not doing the initial but we should have a say in the final rejection because we are the ones that ultimately will have to defend ourselves in court for what our election judges are or are not doing. You are putting the parties in control of picking judges to do this and the parties have no clue what the capabilities of the judges are to begin with. The judges that are being picked by the party could very well have a vested interest in the outcome of the election where staff has no interest in the outcome. We are there to do a job and our staff is there to do a job. Please don't take our jobs out of our hands and put them in hands that can possibly have a huge impact on the outcome of an election.

RECOMMEND: Modification of the rule to allow Staff or the Clerk to have a determination.

6.8 **RECOMMEND:** This should be that the Secretary of State will provide training content.

7.2.6 What is the purpose of this rule it will cause major voter confusion and if it is left blank we will accept the ballot anyways. This is problematic for voter confusion and additional cost of the envelope.

RECOMMEND: This rule to be struck.

7.2.8 I do appreciate the where practicable but what is the purpose of this rule? The electors name is already on the return envelope? Why does it need to be near the self-affirmation area? This is going to be tough for some vendors and maybe impossible to do because of how they spray the address on the return envelope so they would need to make an additional pass through the machines with the envelopes which increase the chance for error's doing this? If we have household swaps they are counted anyway. What is the purpose of this besides additional cost for printing? What is the procedure for ballot envelopes that are not in the initial mailing and are mailed from the office?

RECOMMEND: This rule to be struck.

7.8.8 What guide do we have to audit this? Is the state going to have a % for us to follow or some guide lines?

8.1.5 How will we know they have completed training from the SOS?

8.7 Is this going to be a fillable form that the SOS provides and are we just speculating since it is 90 days out from an election?

8.9 need to clarify that a Watcher can only observe election activities in public areas at a group residential facility.

RECOMMEND to clarify the rule.

8.13 This rule exceeds statutory function a watcher serves in an election. Why are watchers escalating ballots for signature discrepancy? What happened to not interfering with the election process? This is for sure interfering with the election process and this will significantly impact how long it takes to do the signature verification process. **This is in conflict with 8.15.1 “watchers may not personally interrupt or disrupt the processing, verification and counting of any ballots or any other stage of the election” and 8.15.4 “watchers may not interfere with the orderly conduct of any election process, including issuance of ballots, receiving of ballots, and voting or counting of ballots”**

RECOMMEND: This rule to be struck.

8.16 are in conflict with 8.15.1 and 8.15.4.

RECOMMEND: This rule to be struck.

11.3.2(d)(4)(B), 11.3.2(d)(4)(c)(II) This is excessive to do 4 audio ballots will be very time consuming and in election world time is very valuable. 1 audio ballot per testing board member is the recommendation.

RECOMMEND: Each testing board member must cast at least ONE of her test ballots as audio.

Thank you for consideration of the included comments.

Sincerely,

Pamela M. Bacon
Logan County Clerk