

Comments from the Election Statute Review Committee on Proposed Election Rules Dated July 20, 2016

Secretary Williams,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Election Rules. The ESRC submits the following for your consideration.

Rule 1.1.13 (c) – The ESRC supports striking this sub-rule so that counties have options on protecting confidential information.

Rule 7.5.1 – Please strike “clerk” in the main rule and also in sub-rule (e). This change will allow counties flexibility in meeting these requirements.

Rule 8.15.8 – There is not consensus regarding this rule among counties.

Rule 9.2.2 – The revised language appears to require the voter to be notified after a challenge whether or not the ballot is ultimately counted. Please clarify if this rule would apply to signature verification challenges or other types of official challenges.

Rule 11.3.3 (b) – Please clarify if the “audit board” must be different from the “canvass board”.

Rules 14.2.2 and 14.3.3 – The ESRC strongly supports these requirements.

Rule 18.3.2 (c)(3) – It is unclear what the phrase “...a resolution board must work at each resolution workstation.” Please clarify the rule’s intent.

Rule 18.4.1 Recommend changing “markings” to “choices” to clarify that only the voter’s choices are duplicated, not any other information they may write on the ballot.

Rule 18.4.6 – Recommend adding “Before retention for storage” at the beginning of the rule.

Rule 18.5.2 – Because there is no definition of “counting judge”, recommend striking “counting” throughout. Also change “code” to “record”.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please contact Amber McReynolds or Christi Coburn.