

From: [Mary Weiss](#)
To: [SoS Rulemaking](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Election Rules Hearing
Date: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 1:58:52 PM

Dear Secretary Griswold and Rules Making Committee,

I would like to comment on the Proposed Election Rules Hearing that is being held today. I am a 48-year resident of Routt County. I have been active as a signature verification judge for the past 10 years. Our entire team of judges take great pride in the service we offer our community and hold our jobs and integrity in their performance to extremely high standards. I have been impressed with the voting system that Colorado has developed. The benefits of mail in voting in my opinion out-weigh voting at the polls but neither are free from problems.

I would like to address a couple of issues I am uncomfortable with in the proposed Election Rules.

Rule 2.13.2 – Secretary of State to do all Notification of Inactive Voter Registration rather than specific counties. While I might agree that it would be nice to have this under one umbrella, I am concerned about the time frame and volume of work this puts on one agency rather than the specific counties.

Rule 7.3.2-7.3.5 – Reduction of Electronic Voting Standards. We need to double check our systems at all times not allowing for only machine calculations.

Rule 7.7.13a – Elimination of testing of signature verification equipment prior to use in an election. Quite simply I would not take a calculus test without making sure that my calculator is performing correctly. I would not make a 2000-mile trip in my car without having its systems checked by my local mechanic. Fact – machines break, things happen when they are stored and not in daily use. Only common sense would say we need to test the machines prior to use in an election.

Rule 7.7.8 and 7.7.9– Removal of Trained Bi-partisan Signature Verification Judges. To question or remove a Signature Verification Judge simply because they may show an increased number of rejected ballots is an invalid measurement of their ability. Repeatedly we will have four or five batches that have not problems and then there will be one with numerous problems often arising from ballots coming in from the same address. We always check with judges from each party affiliation also confirming with the Clerk or her Election Judge. The recorded rejection will go down with the Judges name who came across the batch but has no reflection on his/her work. The best review of Signature Verification Judges comes from those they work with that have a different party affiliation.

Rule 8.10.2-8.14 – Removal of a poll watchers' ability to dispute a signature. Our elections are Elections of the People and are administered by the clerk's office of each county under the supervision of the Secretary of State's Office. I have no problem with Poll Watchers being present at all voting activities. For them to learn the process and be assured that all working elections are faithfully doing their jobs with the utmost integrity helps the process and the overall general

acceptance of our practices. In my 10 years of working elections, I have never had a watcher question any of the signature verification procedures used in our county. They have not been offensive or contrary. Use of phones should be regulated by the clerk's office which in our case is not allowed.

Rule 20.19.5 – Elimination on the log of those who use Administrative Functions to change what votes are accepted and rejected by vote tallying equipment. This again is backup to who did what and why – invaluable.

I would like to thank you for allowing me to share my opinions. Those of us who serve as Judges honor and respect the process. Elections are the work of the people and while we appreciate the guidance suggested at the state level, I believe the guidance of our local counties at the Clerk's level should supersede the work being done here. They are the ones doing the hard work supporting our training and work and their voices matter.

Best regards,

Mary Weiss
970-846-3137