From: Nick Holst

To: SoS Rulemaking

Subject: Comments on Election Rule Changes

Date: Monday, July 10, 2017 5:32:06 PM

Hello,

I have read (most) of the election rule changes being proposed for discussion on July 11, 2017.

I am giving you my comments, which are below.

First of all, I am much more concerned with ease of voting than I am with virtually non-existent voter fraud many of these changes appear to deal with.

I expect a loosely worded proposition passed by voters to be tempered by experienced, right-thinking office holders and civil servants who know how well the current election systems work.

Having lived in a rural county for many years I know the challenges small, dispersed communities face in complying with rules such as these. 'Uniformity of rules' is the same as 'one size fits all' is especially burdensome in rural counties. Having living in cities, I know the burdens election venues face serving so many voters fast and efficiently.

I also know that rule changes themselves can have a detrimental effect, sowing confusion on all. There is a saying 'Better is the enemy of the good'.

More specifically:

A broad change in deadlines statewide per amendment to Rule 2.5.4 is an undue burden on rural counties and may conflict with their own procedures. Voters should be able to change their party affiliation at will, not because they wish to alter the outcome of another party's primary, but because many people change affiliation based on candidates and issues. Party loyalty is an overworked phrase.

Limiting registration opportunities per the amendment to Rule 2.13.1 is not a good idea, especially when there is virtually no voter fraud occurring and voter suppression is so prevalent. In addition, in rural counties, finding qualified people to man election venues is difficult at best. This change would make that more of a burden.

Limiting the ability of those who man these election venues per amended Rule 2.13.2 would probably introduce more voting errors.