Burgos, Alexander N

From: Martha Svoboda <svoboda.martha@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2026 9:19 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Objection to Proposed Rule Changes re. Absentee Voting

You don't often get email from svoboda.martha@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

August 27, 2026

TO: North Carolina Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

Sent via email

Re: Public comment in opposition to proposed rules regarding absentee ballots (08 NCAC 18 .0201 Definitions; 08 NCAC 18 .0501 Review for Deficiencies; 08 NCAC 18 .0502 Curable Deficiencies; 08 NCAC 18 .0503 Non-Curable Deficiencies; 08 NCAC 18 .0504 Irregularities That Do Not Require Further Action from the Voter; 08 NCAC 18 .0505 Irregularities That Require Further Action)

Dear Members of the Commission:

I am a North Carolina resident and have been a registered NC voter since 2000.

I am writing to oppose the above-referenced proposed Absentee Voting rules, *most especially* **08 NCAC 18 .0505**.

This rule would require county board staff to contact a voter and require *written* confirmation when certain ballot-envelope issues are found. These include situations where the ballot envelope appears to have been opened and resealed but was received in a sealed outer return envelope, where the ballot is not inside a sealed ballot envelope but the ballot and ballot envelope were received in a sealed outer return envelope, or where the ballot in the envelope is different from the ballot transmitted to the voter.

These situations may involve innocent voter mistakes. They do not necessarily mean the voter is ineligible, that the voter did anything wrong, or that the ballot should be rejected.

The problem with this rule is that it puts the burden back on the voter after the voter has already returned their ballot. **Under current General Statutes, the burden of proof is on the challenger.** *These rules would shift the burden of proof* to the voter to challenge the suspicions of the Board members who brought the challenge. Furthermore, many absentee voters may not receive the notice in time, may not understand what is

being asked, may not have reliable mail or email access, or may not be able to respond quickly because of disability, age, displacement, illness, work, school, or caregiving responsibilities.

If a voter returns a ballot in a sealed outer envelope and the county board can determine that the voter is eligible and intended to cast that ballot, the voter should not have to complete extra paperwork just to have the ballot counted. This proposed rule runs the risk of disqualifying ballots cast by eligible voters who clearly communicated their vote and whose ballot was received securely.

Rather, the rule should be changed to:

- Treat these issues as irregularities that should be documented, not as problems requiring voter action, unless there is evidence of tampering or evidence that the voter did not transmit the ballot.
- Move these situations into 08 NCAC 18 .0504 when the ballot was received in a sealed outer envelope.
- Allow the county board to count the ballot if the voter's eligibility, application, and intent can be determined.
- Require voter contact *only* when there is a *genuine* question that cannot be answered from the ballot materials.
- Require county boards to use mail, email, and phone notice **immediately** if voter contact is necessary.
- Allow voters to respond by email, phone, mail, in person, or through a permitted assistant.
- **Prohibit rejection where the voter substantially complied and the issue is not material to whether the voter is eligible to vote.**

The State Board should reject Rule .0505 as written and preserve the existing common-sense approach that counts eligible voters' ballots when technical mistakes do not affect voter eligibility, voter intent, or ballot security.

I would also like to raise objections to the following proposed rule changes:

Re. **08 NCAC 18 .0201 Definitions**

The definitions in this rule should be revised so that ordinary voters can understand the difference between a "deficiency," an "irregularity," a "curable deficiency," and a "non-curable deficiency."

As written, the definitions are technical and may make sense to election lawyers or election administrators, but they are confusing for voters. A voter who receives a notice from the county board should be able to understand (1) what happened, (2) what they need to do, and (3) what will happen if they do not respond.

The definition of "irregularity" is especially important. **The rule should make clear that an "irregularity" is not the same thing as voter fraud, voter ineligibility, or a reason to reject a ballot.** Many irregularities are innocent mistakes that do not affect whether the voter is eligible or whether the voter intended to cast the ballot.

The rule should be amended to state that **technical mistakes should not lead to ballot rejection unless they are material to voter eligibility, ballot security, or voter intent**.

Re. **08 NCAC 18 .0501 Review for Deficiencies**

This rule requires county board staff to review returned absentee ballots for deficiencies or irregularities within one business day.

Prompt review is important, but the rule should include **stronger statewide standards** so voters are treated the same way in every county.

The rule should require county board staff to use uniform statewide forms, uniform written explanations, and uniform procedures when deciding whether something is a deficiency or irregularity. Without clear statewide standards, the same ballot mistake could be treated differently from county to county.

The rule should also require county boards to document the specific reason for any deficiency or irregularity and to keep that documentation with the ballot record. Voters should not lose their ability to cast a ballot based on vague or inconsistent decisions.

Re. **NCAC 18 .0502 Curable Deficiencies**

This rule identifies issues with an absentee ballot that voters can fix.

If this rule is adopted, the State Board should make the cure process as accessible as possible. The rule should require county boards to notify voters by every available method, including mail, email, and phone. If the county board has a voter's phone number or email address anywhere in the voter's record, it should use that information.

The cure notice should be written in plain language. It should clearly say:

- What the problem is.
- What the voter must do to fix it.
- The exact deadline.
- All the ways by which the voter can submit the cure.
- Who may assist the voter.
- A phone number and email address for help.

The rule should also require notices to be available in languages commonly used in the county and in accessible formats for voters with disabilities.

A ballot should not be rejected for a curable deficiency if the voter substantially complies with the cure instructions and the county board can determine that the voter is eligible and intended to cast the ballot.

Re. **08 NCAC 18 .0503 Non-Curable Deficiencies**

This rule lists absentee-ballot issues that would cause the ballot to be spoiled and, if there is enough time, reissued.

This rule should be *narrowed.* **A ballot should be treated as non-curable only when there is no way to determine voter eligibility, voter intent, or ballot security.**

The rule should not classify technical paperwork mistakes as non-curable when the county board can determine (1) who the voter is, (2) that the voter was eligible, and (3) that the voter intended to cast the ballot.

The rule should also require county boards to contact the voter **immediately** by mail, email, and phone before or at the same time the ballot is spoiled and reissued. Voters should not find out too late that their ballot was cancelled.

If the deficiency is discovered close to Election Day, the notice should clearly explain **all** remaining voting options, including early voting, Election Day voting, and any available way to return a reissued absentee ballot on time.

Finally, re. **08 NCAC 18 .0504 Irregularities That Do Not Require Further Action from the Voter**

This rule is a better approach than 08 NCAC 18. 0505 because it recognizes that some technical issues should be documented but should not require the voter to take further action.

As noted above, the State Board should *expand* this rule to include more innocent absentee-ballot mistakes that do not affect voter eligibility or voter intent.

In particular, this rule should include situations where the ballot is received in a sealed outer return envelope, even if there is a technical issue with the inner ballot envelope. **Prior NCSBE guidance treated several of these situations as anomalies, not deficiencies, because the ballot was still received in a sealed envelope.**

The rule should also include situations where two voters in the same household accidentally switch their ballots or ballot envelopes, as long as there are no issues with the applications and the county board can determine which voters cast the ballots. **Prior NCSBE guidance** stated that voters in the same household should *not* have their ballots rejected for that kind of ballot-number mismatch when the mistake is not material to voter eligibility.

The State Board should move these issues into Rule .0504 so voters do not have to complete unnecessary cure paperwork.

Thank you very much for your consideration of my **objections** and comments regarding these five proposed rule changes.

Respectfully,

Martha J. Svoboda, Esq.

Wake County Voter

/s/ Martha J. Svoboda

--
Martha J. Svoboda
919-274-9005 (C)
svoboda.martha@gmail.com

From: Toby Vandemark
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] re mail-in ballot rule
Date: Thursday, August 27, 2026 4:15:45 PM

You don't often get email from tobybvan@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I wish to object to the new mail in ballot rule that was agreed upon recently. I would like the commission to review this rule as it is quite possible an unsealed ballot should still be curable by the voter. Therefore, I object to this rule.

Thank you,

TobyVandemark
110 S Churton Street
Hillsborough, NC 27278

Common Cause
North Carolina

P.O. Box 6207
Raleigh, NC 27628
919.836.0027
CommonCauseNC.org

July 14, 2026

Via Electronic Mail (rulemaking.sboe@ncsbe.gov)

TO: North Carolina State Board of Elections
Francis X. De Luca, Chair
Stacy "Four" Eggers IV, Secretary
Jeff Carmon, Member
Siobhan O'Duffy Millen, Member
Angela Hawkins, Member

RE: Public Comment to Proposed Absentee-by-mail Rules 08 NCAC 18. 0201 et seq.

Mr. Chair, Mr. Secretary, and Members of the State Board of Elections,

Common Cause North Carolina is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization whose mission is to promote good government and a democracy that works for all North Carolinians. We are responding to the North Carolina State Board's invitation to the public to comment on changes to 08 NCAC 18.0505 related to the processing and counting of absentee ballots (hereinafter referred to as the "Proposed Rules"), which are currently under consideration by the State Board. Our comments are based on our organization's more than 50 years of experience conducting voter education, voter protection and county/state board of elections advocacy work in North Carolina and our sincere aim to protect the vote of every eligible voter in this state.

Absentee-by-mail voting is governed by complex, often cumbersome, rules and requirements promulgated by statute and by State Board rules. To have an absentee-by-mail ballot counted under these rules, voters must navigate rigorous signature rules, photo identification requirements, ballot delivery requirements and deadlines. In the course of submitting absentee-by-mail ballots, voters may make harmless errors that result in eligible, properly voted ballots being returned with certain irregularities that are unrelated to the voter's or the ballot's eligibility. Current guidance and procedures enumerated in Numbered Memo 2021-03 instruct professional staff of county boards to exercise their judgment and significant training to consider the irregularities and accept the irregular ballot as properly cast. The Proposed Rules would do away with that efficient, properly functioning procedure by requiring voters to make further attestation to defend their ballot. This proposed change threatens to punish voters by potentially discarding ballots that previously would have required only administrative action to process and count. The circumstances laid out in more detail below would now require significant further action by eligible voters to save their own vote, introduce additional inefficiencies and burdens on staff time, and fail to accomplish objectives related to integrity of our elections that existing rules already achieve.

First, if a voter forgets to seal their ballot envelope but includes it in the larger sealed outer envelope, that ballot could be treated as deficient under the Proposed Rules. Second, if a voter does not place their

completed ballot in the designated ballot envelope but puts it in the clear sleeve designed for photo ID documentation or within the larger sealed outer envelope which is mailed, that ballot could be treated as deficient under the Proposed Rules. Third, if two voters who live at the same address mistakenly place their ballots in one another's envelopes, both of those ballots could be treated as deficient under the Proposed Rules. In each circumstance, the affected voter would have to attest in writing that they mailed their absentee ballot in the way the county board of elections received it to cure their ballot and have it counted. This could lead to eligible voters getting their votes thrown out if they don't complete their attestation by noon on the Friday after Election Day.

We have serious concerns that these Proposed Rules, if implemented, would unnecessarily disenfranchise eligible voters based on irregularities in ballot submissions that are entirely within the knowledge and ability of county boards of election to remedy without requiring further action by voters to make sure their ballots count. On that basis, we formally oppose the Proposed Rules related to absentee ballots that are currently under review by the North Carolina State Board of Elections.

Over many elections, voters have relied on the judgment and common sense of county boards of elections staff to accept mailed ballots where circumstances plainly suggest that the ballots are not deficient and in need of cure. Current State Board of Elections guidance in Numbered Memo 2021-03 explains, "In all of the above situations, the ballot was received in a sealed envelope and is therefore not deficient." In other words, there is nothing in state law that prevents a county board of elections from counting these ballots without contacting the voter. This guidance is clear and sufficient to meet the State Board's goals of ensuring that absentee-by-mail voting is accessible to voters without sacrificing security or integrity. It does not need to be changed.

We urge the State Board of Elections to reject the Proposed Rules related to absentee-by-mail ballots and adhere to existing guidance in Numbered Memo 2021-03. On behalf of voters in North Carolina, we appreciate the opportunity to submit this comment, and hope you will consider these concerns in your consideration of the Proposed Rules.

Respectfully submitted,

Sailor Jones,
State Director, Common Cause North Carolina

Brooks Fuller.
Policy Director, Common Cause North Carolina

Tyler Daye,
Policy Program Manager, Common Cause North Carolina

Common Cause
North Carolina

P.O. Box 6207
Raleigh, NC 27628
919.836.0027
CommonCauseNC.org

July 14, 2026

Via Electronic Mail (rulemaking.sboe@ncsbe.gov)

TO: North Carolina State Board of Elections
Francis X. De Luca, Chair
Stacy "Four" Eggers IV, Secretary
Jeff Carmon, Member
Siobhan O'Duffy Millen, Member
Angela Hawkins, Member

RE: Public Comment to Proposed Polling Site Rules 08 NCAC 10C .0101 et seq

Mr. Chair, Mr. Secretary, and Members of the State Board of Elections,

Common Cause North Carolina is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization whose mission is to promote good government and a democracy that works for all North Carolinians. We are responding to the North Carolina State Board's invitation to the public to comment on changes to 08 NCAC 10C.0104(c)(1)-(c)(2) related to sound and sound amplification at polling sites (hereinafter referred to as the "Proposed Rules"), which are currently under consideration by the State Board. Our comments are based on our organization's more than 50 years of experience conducting voter education, voter protection and county/state board of elections advocacy work in North Carolina and our sincere aim to promote safe and orderly polling sites that balance First Amendment interests of voters and the public.

We write with serious concerns that the Proposed Rules related to sound and sound amplification at polling sites threaten to unconstitutionally limit protected expression in violation of the First Amendment. The Proposed Rules, while couched in neutral terms, are overbroad and unduly burdensome. They prohibit "any noise at a volume that is audible…in the voting enclosure." The breadth of these rules invites unequal enforcement by precinct officials based on the official's subjective approval or disapproval of activities being engaged in by people gathered at the polls. While voting sites should be secure and orderly, these Proposed Rules do not accomplish those objectives in a manner consistent with the First Amendment. On that basis, these Proposed Rules should be rejected.

For decades, the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that speech may be regulated more stringently at polling places than in other traditional public forums (*see* Burson v. Freeman, 501 U.S. 191 (1992)). The Court has also recognized that state governments may reasonably regulate certain speech and "take steps to ensure that partisan discord not follow the voter up to the voting booth" (Minnesota Voters Alliance v. Mansky, 585 U.S. 1 (2018)). While the intent of the Proposed Rules appears to be limiting disruption at polling sites, the text of the Proposed Rules would allow precinct officials to arbitrarily and capriciously police any sound they can hear while indoors, including sounds made by non-disruptive, constitutionally protected activity complying with local noise ordinances.

Precinct officials could silence any cheer, clap, song or other celebratory sound happening outside the polling place that can be heard inside the voting enclosure.

Common Cause North Carolina's membership, its HBCU Student Action Alliance, and its coalition partners, have a rich history of organizing nonpartisan, non-disruptive, pro-voter demonstrations and celebrations at polling sites. Every election year, our community organizers and campus fellows convene marches to the polls to engage community members in shared celebrations of democracy's most sacred act. Just this past year, our organizers joined students and community members at North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University in a march to the polls to simultaneously cast their ballots and call for the restoration of an early voting site on the campus of the largest HBCU in the country. These Proposed Rules could allow precinct officials, acting inconsistently and arbitrarily, to drastically curtail constitutionally protected expression associated with these and other similar events.

Such limits on speech are incompatible with a healthy democracy.

The total ban on sound amplification is even more problematic. It bars anyone "outside of the voting place at a voting site" from using any non-emergency, non-accessibility related "sound amplification device" during voting hours regardless of whether that sound can be heard inside the voting enclosure and regardless of whether that sound is disruptive. This essentially creates a "zero tolerance" policy around speech that our constitution does not permit. Because the rules define "voting site" broadly as "the property on which the voting place is located," a precinct official can immediately ban many forms of constitutionally protected speech using sound amplification anywhere on the property, including areas located far from where election-related activities are taking place. This would particularly threaten speech around large voting sites such as public libraries and schools, including in public forums traditionally used for speech. While voters should be protected from serious disruption, democracy does not require a quiet zone.

Because the bar for violating these rules is so low, the rules will likely create circumstances where some speakers are chastised or removed for engaging in activities that other speakers are allowed to engage in freely, based solely on whether a particular listener can hear that speech a single time. A precinct official intent on quieting speech in traditional public forums contiguous to voting sites runs a serious risk of creating the exact sort of disruption these rules appear to be designed to prevent.

Existing rules already permit the chief judge to maintain order at the polls and to coordinate with local law enforcement when assistance is required. However, the Proposed Rules are written so broadly and are so burdensome that they seriously risk depriving community members – including churchgoers, civic organizations, and student voters eager to celebrate voting – of the right to engage in their democracy through free speech. Narrowly tailored rules around conduct at voting sites, and accompanying guidance from the State Board, should emphasize that precinct officials should only use their authority to maintain order at polling sites to remedy actual disruption reported by voters.

We urge the State Board of Elections to reject the Proposed Rules related to conduct at voting sites and to commit time and resources to protecting voters and election workers from disruptive conduct and intimidation without trampling on the First Amendment rights of North Carolinians. On behalf of voters in North Carolina, we appreciate the opportunity to submit this comment, and hope you will consider these concerns in your consideration of the Proposed Rules.

Respectfully submitted,

Sailor Jones,
State Director, Common Cause North Carolina

Rotrina Campbell,
Organizing Director, Common Cause North Carolina

Jazmyne Abney,
HBCU Program Manager, Common Cause North Carolina

Common Cause
North Carolina

P.O. Box 6207
Raleigh, NC 27628
919.836.0027
CommonCauseNC.org

July 14, 2026

Via Electronic Mail (rulemaking.sboe@ncsbe.gov)

TO: North Carolina State Board of Elections
Francis X. De Luca, Chair
Stacy "Four" Eggers IV, Secretary
Jeff Carmon, Member
Siobhan O'Duffy Millen, Member
Angela Hawkins, Member

RE: Public Comment to Proposed Voter ID Rules 08 NCAC 17. 0101 and 08 NCAC 17. 0109

Mr. Chair, Mr. Secretary, and Members of the State Board of Elections,

Common Cause North Carolina is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization whose mission is to promote good government and a democracy that works for all North Carolinians. We are responding to the North Carolina State Board's invitation to the public to comment on changes to 08 NCAC 17 .0101 and 08 NCAC 17 .0109 related to the procedures for the verification of photo identification for in-person and absentee-by-mail voting (hereinafter referred to as the "Proposed Rules"), which are currently under consideration by the North Carolina State Board of Elections. Our comments are based on our organization's more than 50 years of experience conducting voter education, voter protection and county/state board of elections advocacy work in North Carolina and our sincere aim to protect the vote of every eligible voter in this state.

We write to express serious concerns with — and to formally oppose — proposed amendments to State Board of Elections rules that govern the procedures for the verification of voter identification, which are currently under review by the State Board. These Proposed Rules, specifically sections 08 NCAC 17 .0101 (e)(2) and 08 NCAC 17 .0109 (c)(2), would allow county boards of elections to vote along party lines when determining whether to reject a ballot because there are "grounds to believe" the voter provided false information on a voter identification exception form. The rules invite partisan pressures to enter the consideration of facts which should be determined with no regard whatsoever to partisanship. The unanimity requirement enshrined in the current rules adequately and crucially protects against the wrongful rejection of ballots cast by eligible voters with valid reasonable impediments who are entitled to have their ballots counted under the state's voter ID law. These rules work well and provide a fair, bi-partisan, uniform process by requiring a unanimous finding of grounds to believe the voter provided false information to justify rejecting a ballot. The current rules also bolster voters' confidence that North Carolina's voter ID requirements will be applied free from partisan considerations or gamesmanship.

The Proposed Rules could create significantly more instances where county boards of elections are rejecting voter identification exception forms — and therefore ballots — on short timelines without

necessary facts available to them to properly adjudicate disputes around provisional ballots. The unanimity requirement is an important procedural and substantive safeguard for ensuring that eligible voters' ballots are not put at risk because of hasty, insufficient investigations or partisan mischief. The Proposed Rules would upend a well-functioning system in favor of a system that could be manipulated by partisan actions and may result in even more delay and investigative burdens during an already short time for county boards to process provisional ballots. Eliminating the unanimity requirement in favor of a majority requirement also increases the likelihood of unequal and inconsistent application of the rules from county to county.

The current unanimity requirement for voter identification exception forms mirrors current State Board of Elections guidelines for poll workers reviewing photo IDs at polling locations. In instances where a check-in official believes the voter's photo ID does not meet the name and photo requirements, the judges at the polling site proceed to a hearing. As explained in State Board of Elections Numbered Memo 2023-03, "[I]f at least one judge determines the photo ID meets the legal requirements, then the voter proceeds with the check-in process and will vote with a regular ballot unless there is some other reason under the election laws for them to vote with a provisional ballot. If the judges unanimously agree the voter's photo ID does not meet the legal requirements, the voter will still be permitted to vote and will vote with a provisional ballot."

Rather than strengthening election security and integrity, these Proposed Rules risk undermining public confidence in our democratic process by making participation more difficult for eligible voters and increasing the likelihood that partisan composition of county boards will determine whose votes count. Election integrity and voter access are not opposing goals. A fair and secure election system must prioritize accuracy while protecting the fundamental right to vote and access to the ballot. The requirement for a unanimous vote to reject a voter ID exception form serves these goals by ensuring accuracy while protecting ballot access from partisan interference.

We urge the State Board of Elections to reject the Proposed Rules related to voter ID requirements, specifically the provisions replacing the unanimity requirement for rejecting a voter ID exception form with a majority vote requirement. On behalf of voters in North Carolina, we appreciate the opportunity to submit this comment, and hope you will consider these concerns in your consideration of the Proposed Rules.

Respectfully submitted,

Sailor Jones,
State Director, Common Cause North Carolina

Brooks Fuller,
Policy Director, Common Cause North Carolina

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Joanne Empie <joanne.empie@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 11:37 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam

Subject: [External] 08 NCAC 17 .0101 VERIFICATION OF PHOTO IDENTIFICATION DURING IN-PERSON VOTING recommendations

You don't often get email from joanne.empie@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Hello Mr Burgos,

Recommendations on **08 NCAC 17 .0101 VERIFICATION OF PHOTO IDENTIFICATION DURING IN-PERSON VOTING**

(a)(3) To assure verification of the voter, the name on the photo ID must be the same as the first and last name contained on the voter's registration record. "Substantially equivalent" should be removed. The remainder of Section (3) should be deleted.

Matching the name on the ID to the voter registration record, as well as the photo to the person is needed to reduce the likelihood of duplicate registrations and mismatches. The law requires the full legal name on the NC voter registration application. Using the term "substantially equivalent" is very subjective and creates a large grey area for many name variations being accepted. Requiring the full legal name is an incentive to get the names correct in the voter registration system. Having the names the same on the ID and voter registration list are the responsibility of the voter. They have been provided a Voter Registration card after registering with their information. It has instructions to review the information and report any changes needed. The accuracy of the voter rolls is important to secure elections. Name changes can be accepted during early voting. GS §163-82.6A.

Not requiring the name on ID to be the same as the voter registration record exceeds the agency's statutory authority

(b) To assure verification of the voter, the photo ID "shall verify the photograph that the photograph is that of the person seeking to vote" The term “reasonable resemblance” should be removed since it is not consistent with ***§ 163-166.16.***

§ 163-166.16. Requirement for photo identification to vote in person*.*
(b) Verification of Photo Identification. – After presentation of the required identification described in subsection (a) of this section, the precinct officials assigned to check registration shall compare the photograph contained on the required identification with the person presenting to vote. The precinct official shall verify that the photograph is that of the person seeking to vote.

Using the term “verify” is a more definitive term than “reasonable resemblance” to identify when the photo ID has been determined to identify the person presenting to vote.

Not "verifying" the voter using the photograph exceeds the agency's statutory authority

Thank you for your consideration.

Joanne Empie
NCEIT volunteer
Raleigh NC
919-819-1981

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Joanne Empie <joanne.empie@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 11:22 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] 08 NCAC 17 .0109 PHOTO IDENTIFICATION FOR ABSENTEE-BY-MAIL BALLOTS recommendations

You don't often get email from joanne.empie@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Hello Mr Burgos,

Recommendations on **08 NCAC 17 .0109 PHOTO IDENTIFICATION FOR ABSENTEE-BY-MAIL BALLOTS**

(c)(2) Add this to this section -

In the event they receive intentionally falsified information from the voter during the canvassing process, the State Board Investigations Division should be notified and all related documents submitted by the voter should be provided to them.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joanne Empie.
NCEIT volunteer
Raleigh NC
919-819-1981

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Joanne Empie <joanne.empie@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 10:13 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] 08 NCAC 09 .0110 SECONDARY RECOUNTS recommendations

You don't often get email from joanne.empie@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Hello Mr Burgos,

Recommendations on **08 NCAC 09 .0110 SECONDARY RECOUNTS**

Title - Adding more information to the title would be more meaningful to the reader to describe what the second recount relates to such as SECONDARY RECOUNTS - Machine

Recounts.

The current rule is not clear and would help avoid confusion about the process for the reader.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joanne Empie.
NCEIT volunteer
Raleigh NC
919-819-1981

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Joanne Empie <joanne.empie@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 9:33 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] 08 NCAC 10C .0103 ELECTIONEERING ZONE recommendations

You don't often get email from joanne.empie@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Hello Mr Burgos,

Recommendations on **08 NCAC 10C.0103 ELECTIONEERING ZONE** are consistent with those provided on **08 NCAC 10C.0101 DEFINITIONS.**

The term “electioneering zone” is not consistent with NC General Statutes and adds another layer of complexity which is not needed. It should be removed. NC General Statutes use the term “area for election related activity” with the simple definition of "an area adjacent to the buffer zone" The rule should use this term. The concept of "area for election related activity" is much easier to understand and enforce. Nothing more is needed to distinguish between the "buffer zone" and "area for election- related activity" as defined in § 163-166.4 shown below. The law does not provide any restrictions in terms of location on the “area for election-related activity”.

§ ***163-166.4.*** *Limitation on activity in the voting place and in a buffer zone around it.*

(a) ***Buffer Zone****. – No person or group of persons shall hinder access, harass others, distribute campaign literature, place political advertising, solicit votes, or otherwise engage in election-related activity in the voting place or in a buffer zone which shall be prescribed by the county board of elections around the voting place. In determining the dimensions of that buffer zone for each voting place, the county board of elections shall, where practical, set the limit at 50 feet from the door of entrance to the voting place, measured when that door is closed, but in no event shall it set the limit at more than 50 feet or at less than 25 feet.*

(b) ***Area for Election-Related Activity.*** *– Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, the county board of elections shall also provide an area adjacent to the buffer zone for each voting place in which persons or groups of persons may distribute campaign literature, place political advertising, solicit votes, or otherwise engage in election-related activity*

The rule exceeds the agency's authority by not being consistent with § 163-166.4 and is ambiguous due to the G. S. which uses different terminology.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joanne Empie.
NCEIT volunteer
Raleigh NC
919-819-1981

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Joanne Empie <joanne.empie@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 4:53 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] 08 NCAC 10C.0104 CONDUCT AT VOTING SITES recommendations

You don't often get email from joanne.empie@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Hello Mr Burgos,

I am providing the following recommendations on **08 NCAC 10C.0104 CONDUCT AT VOTING SITES**

(c) This section should only limit noise which interferes with activities in the polling place and voting enclosures. Noise outside may be chaotic, but need only to be addressed if it interferes with activities in the curbside voting enclosure. Local ordinances on noise and conduct prevail. NC GS 163-166.4 does not address noise.

§ 163-166.4

(b) Area for Election-Related Activity. – Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, the county board of elections shall also provide an area adjacent to the buffer zone for each voting place in which persons or groups of persons may distribute campaign literature, place political advertising, solicit votes, or otherwise engage in election-related activity

The rule is not clear that only noise which disrupts voters in the polling place and voting enclosures should be addressed by judges. It also seeks to limit Election -Related Activity which exceeds the agency's statutory authority. If noise or other disruptive behavior occurs, police can be called based on local ordinances.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joanne Empie.
NCEIT volunteer
Raleigh NC
919-819-1981

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Joanne Empie <joanne.empie@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 4:04 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] 08 NCAC 18 .0503 NON-CURABLE DEFICIENCIES recommendations

You don't often get email from joanne.empie@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Hello Mr Burgos,

Recommendations on **08 NCAC 18 .0503 NON-CURABLE DEFICIENCIES**

(a)(13) Add a provision in this section to clarify that only ballots that are in a sealed ballot envelope which match the application are to be counted. This may come in play when multiple ballots are returned in the absentee ballot return package. Those other ballots that do not match the application would be voided. There is no reason for all the ballots to be discarded, if one meets all the requirements. The rule exceeds the agency's statutory authority, as it does not count absentee ballots that have all the required information.

(a) (14) Add a non-curable deficiency in the case when the personal identification number (DL# or last four of SSN) in the ballot return package does not match the voter's registration record. This is an easy cross check that should be done to verify identity. Any mismatches should result in a spoiled ballot. This rule is ambiguous as it is not clear that the personal identification number associated with the ballot is the same one that is on the voter registration application form and entitles the person to vote. It also may exceed statutory authority regarding **§ 163-82.4. Contents of application form** which requires "(11) Drivers license number or, if the applicant does not have a drivers license number, the last four digits of the applicant's social security number,"

(b) (1) There should be clarification of the 2 different absentee ballot packages to avoid confusion. One that is mailed to the voter with materials (mail out package) and one that is returned by the voter with their ballot (return package). The rule is ambiguous as it does not make the distinction between these two different absentee ballot packages.

Thank you for considering.

Joanne Empie.

NCEIT volunteer

Raleigh NC

919-819-1981

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Joanne Empie <joanne.empie@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 4:20 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] 08 NCAC 10C.0101 DEFINITIONS recommendations

You don't often get email from joanne.empie@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Hello Mr Burgos,

Recommendations on **08 NCAC 10C.0101 DEFINITIONS**

The term “electioneering zone” is not consistent with NC General Statutes and adds another layer of complexity which is not needed. It should be removed. NC General Statutes use the term “area(s) for election related activity” with the simple definition of "an area adjacent to the buffer zone for each voting place in which persons or groups of persons may distribute campaign literature, place political advertising, solicit votes, or otherwise engage in election-related activity an area outside the buffer zone." The rule should use this term. The concept of area (s) for election related activity is much easier to understand and enforce. Nothing more is needed to distinguish between the buffer zone and area for election related activity as defined in § 163-166.4 shown below.

§ ***163-166.4.*** *Limitation on activity in the voting place and in a buffer zone around it.*

(a) ***Buffer Zone****. – No person or group of persons shall hinder access, harass others, distribute campaign literature, place political advertising, solicit votes, or otherwise engage in election-related activity in the voting place or in a buffer zone which shall be prescribed by the county board of elections around the voting place. In determining the dimensions of that buffer zone for each voting place, the county board of elections shall, where practical, set the limit at 50 feet from the door of entrance to the voting place, measured when that door is closed, but in no event shall it set the limit at more than 50 feet or at less than 25 feet.*

(b) ***Area for Election-Related Activity.*** *– Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, the county board of elections shall also provide an area adjacent to the buffer zone for each voting place in which persons or groups of persons may distribute campaign literature, place political advertising, solicit votes, or otherwise engage in election-related activity*

The rule exceeds the agency's authority by not being consistent with § 163-166.4 and is ambiguous due to the G. S. which uses different terminology.

Thank you for considering.

Joanne Empie.
NCEIT volunteer
Raleigh NC
919-819-1981

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Sidney Reynolds <reynoldssidney1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 4:08 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] RE: First Recount Rule, 09.0107

You don't often get email from reynoldssidney1@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I am writing to formally comment on the First Recount Rule, 09.0107.

Proposed -

Section (b): To add clarity to a procedure, it will be helpful to add a sentence indicating that, in order to remove the risk of machine calibration error affecting the vote count, the tabulator used for the recount should be different from the tabulator used in the original count. It seems that simple change would allow you to troubleshoot a potential cause of variance quickly as well as verify the tally. (In my county, they run the ballots back through the same tabulator used at the polling site.)

Section (c) (1) and (2): In order to reinforce statutory consistency, it seems the reference to "Rule .0106(d)" should be changed to "08 NCAC 09 .0106(d)" and reference to "Rule .0109" should be changed to "08 NCAC 09. 0109."

Thank you for your consideration,

Sidney Reynolds

434 Moore Perkerson Road

Spring Hope, NC 27882

(919) 612-9755

Thank you.

(Name, Address)

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Debbie D. <infernodeb@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 2:16 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Comment on Proposed Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101 (Definitions)

You don't often get email from infernodeb@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I am submitting the following comments on the Proposed Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101 (Definitions)

The term “Electioneering Zone” was not created by North Carolina’s official state laws. Instead, the NCSBE made it up. In the rule they are proposing, they define this zone very broadly. That definition could clash with people’s First Amendment free-speech rights. The U.S. Supreme Court has already protected those rights. In the 1992 case *Burson v. Freeman*, the Court said that if the government tries to control people asking for votes too far away from the polling places, it can become an unfair limit on free speech.

The term instead should be "area for election related activity" as set out in NCGS 163-166.4(b).

Per the U.S. Supreme Court, buffer zone restrictions are permissible only to a uniform and defensible distance from the polling place, but that election-related activity restrictions beyond the buffer zone are impermissible, particularly on public sidewalks and in public parking lots.

Thank you for your consideration.

Debbie Dante
Henderson County
10 Year Prior Cty BOE Member

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Debbie D. <infernodeb@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 1:56 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Comment on Proposed Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0103 (Electioneering Zone)

You don't often get email from infernodeb@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I am submitting the following comments on the Proposed Permanent Rule **08 NCAC 10C .0103 ELECTIONEERING ZONE:**

This rule exceeds the SBOE's statutory authority by using the term "electioneering" as opposed to "area for election related activity" as referenced in NCGS 163-166.4(b).

This rule gives Cty BOE's the unnecessary authority to designate an area OUTSIDE the 50" no electioneering zone (buffer zone). The buffer zone should be the only area they may control.

Thank you for your consideration.

Debbie Dante
Henderson County
10 Year Prior Cty BOE Member

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Deanna De'Liberto <2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 12:09 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N; rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Comment on Conduct at Voting Sites 10C .0104

You don't often get email from 2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

1. The terminology in paragraph (b) should conform to the language already established in state law. N.C.G.S. § 163-166.4(b) identifies the designated location as an **"area for election-related activity."** Using that same language in the administrative rule would avoid creating a separate label for an area that is already defined by statute.
2. The purpose of paragraph (c) should be limited to protecting the voting process from actual disruption. Noise occurring elsewhere on or near the property should not, by itself, constitute a violation. To fall within this rule, the sound should be sufficiently loud to be heard **inside the voting enclosure** and interfere with the orderly conduct of voting. While (c)(1) makes this relationship reasonably clear, (c)(2) does not establish the same standard.
3. I recommend removing subparagraph (c)(2). As currently drafted, it regulates particular methods of producing sound without first requiring a showing that the sound is disrupting voting. That approach could unnecessarily restrict lawful expressive activity occurring on public sidewalks, parking areas, or other locations where First Amendment protections apply. Rather than prohibiting particular devices or activities—such as amplified sound, music, or bullhorns—the rule should focus on whether the conduct actually interferes with voters or election administration. **Existing local noise ordinances can address excessive noise that does not rise to the level of interference with the voting process.**

Deanna Marie De'Liberto
2nd Vice-Chair
Guilford County Republican Party

2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us
(336) 932-6137

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Deanna De'Liberto <2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 12:13 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N; rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Comment on Voting Site Rules Definitions 10C.0101

You don't often get email from 2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

1. The definition of **"Electioneering Zone"** raises concern because that term is not the terminology used in N.C.G.S. § 163-166.4(b). The statute establishes a buffer zone around the voting place and separately recognizes an area outside that boundary where election-related activity may occur. Any definition adopted by rule should preserve that distinction and should not suggest that the State Board has broader authority to regulate protected political activity beyond the statutory buffer zone.
2. The rule would be clearer and more consistent with state law if it used **"Area for Election-Related Activity."** That language accurately describes the location outside the buffer zone where individuals may distribute campaign materials, display political advertising, solicit votes, and engage in other election-related activities permitted under N.C.G.S. § 163-166.4(b). Using the statutory language would also make the relationship between the buffer zone and the area outside it easier to understand.
3. Calling this area an **"Electioneering Zone"** could create unnecessary confusion for election officials, campaign volunteers, and others working at voting sites. The terminology may imply that the entire area is subject to the same restrictions that apply within the buffer zone. The rule should instead make clear that the buffer zone represents the restricted area established by law, while election-related activity outside that boundary remains subject to applicable law and constitutional protections. In *Burson v. Freeman*, the U.S. Supreme Court recognized the government's authority to impose certain restrictions near polling places while also acknowledging that, at some distance from the polls, restrictions on vote solicitation can become an impermissible burden.

Deanna Marie De'Liberto
2nd Vice-Chair
Guilford County Republican Party

2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us
(336) 932-6137

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Deanna De'Liberto <2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 12:20 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N; rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam

Subject: [External] Comment on Recount Guidelines 09.0106

You don't often get email from 2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

1. **Paragraph (d), lines 22–28:** If the county board adds an unaffiliated member or a member of another political party to a bipartisan team, that individual should **replace one of the existing team members rather than increase the size of the team to five**. The language should be clarified so there is no question that the team remains limited to the number of members otherwise provided for in the rule.
2. **Paragraph (d), line 20:** The deleted language should be restored and revised to allow the **two political parties with the largest number of registered voters in the State to provide input on the assignment of members to recount teams**. Including party input helps ensure meaningful bipartisan participation in the recount process. The county board would continue to make the actual assignments, but there is no reason to eliminate the opportunity for the political parties to provide input.
3. **Page 2, line 2:** The language stating that the apparent winner is the apparent loser following the discretionary recount is clear as written. It simply describes the circumstance in which the candidate who initially appeared to have won is shown by the recount to have lost. No additional clarification appears necessary.
4. **Page 2, line 10:** The reference to the **"bipartisan team of two county board members overseeing the recount"** should instead refer to the bipartisan team that was assigned to conduct the tally. This would provide continuity and avoid suggesting that a separate team must be appointed to oversee this portion of the recount.
5. **Page 2, line 19:** The language stating that **"one board member of each political party shall be represented"** is also clear in context. Lines 17–18 already establish that the provision is referring to county board members, so repeating that language is unnecessary.
6. **Section (f), page 2, lines 11–12:** Delete the sentence allowing the State Board to delegate to the Executive Director the authority to declare completion of a machine recount involving ballot items under the State Board's jurisdiction. **The State Board should retain responsibility for making the final declaration that the recount is complete.** The Executive Director and staff may review the recount and make a recommendation to the State Board, but the final determination should remain with the Board.
7. **Hand-to-eye recount provisions:** Move the discussion of hand-to-eye recounts currently contained in the General Guidelines to **08 NCAC 09 .0110, Second Recount**. The current structure places information about hand-to-eye recounts in paragraphs (d) and (f) of the General Guidelines as well as in the rule specifically addressing the second recount. Consolidating those

provisions in one location would make the recount rules easier to follow and prevent users from having to consult several different sections to determine the procedures that apply.

Deanna Marie De'Liberto
2nd Vice-Chair
Guilford County Republican Party

📧 2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us
📞 (336) 932-6137

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Deanna De'Liberto <2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 12:29 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N; rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Comment on Non-Curable Deficiencies 18.0503

You don't often get email from 2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

1. **Item (a)(9), lines 24–26:** The deficiency described here appears to be one that can be corrected by the voter. For that reason, it should be treated as a **curable deficiency** and addressed under **08 NCAC 18 .0502** rather than included among the non-curable deficiencies in this rule.
2. **Multiple ballots returned in one package:** The rule should explain how to handle a return package containing more than one absentee ballot. If a voter properly requested an absentee ballot and that voter's completed ballot is returned in its **own sealed ballot envelope**, that ballot should not automatically be rejected simply because additional ballots were improperly included in the same return package. The rule should distinguish the valid ballot and envelope from any other ballots in the package that cannot be accepted.
3. **Identification-number mismatch:** The list of non-curable deficiencies should also address situations in which the personal identification number provided with an absentee ballot request—either the **driver license number or the last four digits of the Social Security number—does not match the information in the voter's registration record**.
4. **Treatment of a PIN mismatch:** Because absentee-by-mail voting occurs outside the polling place and without the same in-person verification procedures, the rules should provide a clear process for resolving identification discrepancies. A mismatch involving the driver's license number or last four digits of the Social Security number should be identified as a **non-curable deficiency**. The affected ballot would be spoiled, with a replacement ballot issued when permitted and appropriate. This would establish a consistent procedure for election officials when the identification information associated with an absentee request cannot be verified against the voter's registration record.

Deanna Marie De'Liberto
2nd Vice-Chair
Guilford County Republican Party

2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us
(336) 932-6137

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Deanna De'Liberto <2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 12:31 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N; rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Comment on First Recount 09.0107

You don't often get email from 2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

1. **Section (b):** The rule should specify that the recount be conducted using a **different tabulator from the one used for the original count**. Using a different machine provides an additional safeguard against the possibility that a calibration or equipment issue with the original tabulator could produce the same error during the recount.
2. **Section (c)(1) and (2):** The rule references should use the **complete administrative code citations** for clarity and consistency. Replace "Rule .0106(d)" with **"08 NCAC 09 .0106(d)"** and replace "Rule .0109" with **"08 NCAC 09 .0109."**

Deanna Marie De'Liberto
2nd Vice-Chair
Guilford County Republican Party

2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us
(336) 932-6137

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Deanna De'Liberto <2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 12:34 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N; rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Comment on Irregularities Do Not Require Further Action 18.0504

You don't often get email from 2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

1. Delete this rule in its entirety. The provisions do not appear to establish a regulatory requirement that warrants a separate administrative rule. The situations described can be addressed through election procedures and guidance rather than rulemaking.
2. The proposed rule introduces the term “irregularity,” although that term is not defined for this purpose in the North Carolina General Statutes. Creating a new category is unnecessary, particularly because many different issues can arise in the preparation or return of absentee ballot materials and the rule addresses only a small number of them.
3. Not every departure from the prescribed absentee ballot process requires an administrative rule. There are numerous circumstances in which a voter or election official may fail to follow a procedure exactly, yet no special regulatory action is required. The two situations involving the contents of absentee ballot return packages identified in this rule can be handled through established administrative procedures. Policies, written guidance, or standard operating procedures would be a more appropriate way to address these circumstances.

Deanna Marie De’Liberto
2nd Vice-Chair
Guilford County Republican Party

2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us
(336) 932-6137

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Deanna De'Liberto <2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 12:37 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N; rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Comment on Irregularities That Require Further Action 18.0505

You don't often get email from 2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

1. **This rule should be eliminated and its substantive provisions incorporated into 08 NCAC 18 .0502, Curable Deficiencies.** There is no need to create a separate category of "irregularities" when the issues being addressed are more appropriately treated as deficiencies. Because **"deficiency" is the terminology used in the North Carolina General Statutes**, using the same term in the administrative rules would provide greater consistency and avoid unnecessary terminology.
2. **Consolidating these provisions under .0502 would also make the absentee ballot rules easier to understand and administer.** The procedures for addressing curable and non-curable deficiencies are already contained in **08 NCAC 18 .0502 and .0503**. Keeping the applicable requirements within those two rules would provide a more organized process for reviewing absentee ballot return packages and eliminate the need for a separate rule covering essentially the same subject.

Deanna Marie De'Liberto
2nd Vice-Chair
Guilford County Republican Party

2ndvicechair@guilfordgop.us
(336) 932-6137

Burgos, Alexander N

From: George and Rosemary Abell <roegeorge@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 5:38 AM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Rules for NCEIT Revision urged

You don't often get email from roegeorge@earthlink.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Honorable Burgos,
I appreciate your reviewing the upcoming NC voting regulations.
Most, (6) of the proposed 7 regulations need review and updates, except for voting irregularities 18.0504.
Our vote is precious as a US Citizen, with updates needed as our North Carolina's population grows.

Thank you for reviewing my thoughts.

Regards,
George S. Abell

George S. Abell

4045 Sapling Trail

Hillsborough, NC 27278-9052

Cell: 1-919-239-9231

RoeGeorge@Earthlink.Net

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kathy Yurista <kaleidoscope9@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 3:03 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on Recount Guidelines rule, 09.0106.

You don't often get email from kaleidoscope9@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Mr Burgos,

When I read the recount guideline rule 09.0106, I wondered why eliminating folks from the two major parties for the recount were excluded in this guideline rule? It makes sense that those parties be included as that's where most of the votes come from and ask that they be added back into line 20 of this guideline 09.0106.

What about the section f, p.2, lines 11 - 12 which state...*For machine recounts of ballot items under the jurisdiction of the State Board, the declaration of the completion of the recount may be delegated by the State Board to the Executive Director of the State Board."*
Why would this really be a good idea? It's the State Board's responsibility to make the declaration of the completion of the recount. Keep it that way. I suggest that this sentence be deleted from section f, p.2, lines 11 - 12.

Thank you,
Kathy Yurista
PO Box 781
Hendersonville NC 28793

--
"Nourishment is one of the greatest gifts we can give ourselves"

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jim Womack <james.k.womack@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 10:39 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] NCEIT Comments on Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101 (Definitions)

You don't often get email from james.k.womack@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

On behalf of the North Carolina Election Integrity Tea, (NCEIT), I am submitting the following comments for Proposed Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101 DEFINITIONS":

1. The term "Electioneering Zone" was not introduced by the NC General Statutes; rather, it was invented by the NC State Board of Elections. As proposed in this rule, the broad definition of the term would put it in conflict with First Amendment Freedoms that have been affirmed by U.S. Supreme Court Case Law (*Burson v. Freeman*, 504 U.S. 191, 210 (1992) "At some measurable distance from the polls, of course, governmental regulation of vote solicitation could effectively become an impermissible burden.").

2. The term to be included in the list of definitions should be "Area(s) for Election-related Activity," not "Electioneering Zone" which is much more restrictive in its connotation. The NC General Statute 163-166.4(b) defines the area outside the buffer zone as the "Area for Election-related Activity." The is a much better term for "the area(s) adjacent to but outside the buffer zone for each voting place in which persons or groups of persons my distribute campaign literature, place political advertising, solicit votes, or otherwise engage in election-related activity as stipulated by G.S. 163-166.4(b)."

3. The term "Electioneering Zone" will be confusing to election officials and poll greeters who may misconstrue the controls and restrictions that are permissible outside the buffer zone. The U.S. Supreme Court has clearly ruled that buffer zone restrictions are permissible only to a uniform and defensible distance from the polling place, but that election-related activity restrictions beyond the buffer zone are impermissible, particularly on public sidewalks and in public parking lots.

Jim Womack
President, NCEIT
Tel. (919) 770-4783

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jim Womack <james.k.womack@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 10:46 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] NCEIT Comments on Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0104 (Conduct at Voting Sites)

You don't often get email from james.k.womack@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

On behalf of the North Carolina Election Integrity Tea, (NCEIT), I am submitting the following comments for Proposed Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0104 CONDUCT AT VOTING SITES

1. Paragraph (b) of this proposed rule uses the term "electioneering zone" which is an invented term, not supported by the NC General Statutes or U.S. Supreme Court case law. The proper term from NCGS 163-166.4(b) is "Area(s) for Election-related Activity."

2. Paragraph (c) of this proposed rule is supportable, so long as the rule is clear that noise from outside the voting enclosure must be audible inside the enclosure to be considered disruptive. This is clear in sub-paragraph (c)(1) but not in sub-paragraph (c)(2).

3. Sub-paragraph (c)(2) should be stricken from this rule. It potentially abridges First Amendment-protected freedoms. The rule is poorly constructed and does not distinguish car stereos from other speakers or amplifiers, some of which should be permissible in and around voting sites. Attempts to limit persons from playing music or using bullhorns in free speech zones like public parking lots or public sidewalks when they do not interfere with the voter or voting process, are infringements of those persons' First Amendment rights. Cities and counties have noise ordinances that instead should be the legal threshold for regulating audible sounds in and around voting sites.

Jim Womack
President, NCEIT
Tel. (919) 770-4783

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jim Womack <james.k.womack@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 10:53 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] NCEIT Comments on Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 18 .0503 (Non-Curable Deficiencies)

You don't often get email from james.k.womack@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

On behalf of the North Carolina Election Integrity Team (NCEIT), I am submitting the following comments on Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 18 .0503 (Non-Curable Deficiencies):

1. This rule should be re-titled "ABSENTEE BALLOT RETURN PACKAGE NON-CURABLE DEFICIENCIES." The definitions for this series of rules conflate the absentee ballot package that is mailed out to voters with absentee ballot package that is returned by the voters to the local board of elections. These two packages are different and should not be conflated. Clarity in the rulemaking process is essential- so distinctions of the absentee ballot mail-out package and the absentee ballot return package must be made in the rules.

2. Sub-paragraph (a)(13) should be amended to add the following sentence: "Only the ballot for which the application was completed may be accepted. Any additional ballots within the absentee ballot return package must be voided as non-curable." This clarifies the disposition when multiple ballots are returned in one ballot envelope. The rule must be clear to allow counting of the one ballot for which the voter's affidavit and witness information has been provided, but not the additional ballots that may have been enclosed. Those would be non-curable.

3. Sub-paragraph (a)(14) should add another non-curable deficiency as follows: "The absentee voter's personal identification number, when required by G.S. 163-230.1(g)(2) on the photo identification affidavit, does not match the corresponding number on that voter's registration record." Voting by mail is the least observed and secure method of voting. Special safeguards are provided by statute to ensure the legitimacy of the absentee ballot return package. The statute clearly required the disclosure of the voter's personal identification number (PIN) if a photo ID is not available for enclosure in the absentee ballot return package. If the PIN provided does not match that voter's official registration record, then the deficiency must be non-curable.

4. Sub-paragraph (b)(1) should be amended to use the term "absentee ballot mail-out package" in lieu of absentee ballot package.

Jim Womack
President, NCEIT
Tel. (919) 770-4783

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jim Womack <james.k.womack@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 10:59 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] NCEIT Comments on Proposed Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 18.0504 IRREGULARITIES THAT DO NOT REQUIRE FURTHER ACTION FROM THE VOTER

You don't often get email from james.k.womack@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

On behalf of the North Carolina Election Integrity Team (NCEIT), I am submitting the following comments on proposed permanent rule 08 NCAC 18.0504 IRREGULARITIES THAT DO NOT REQUIRE FURTHER ACTION FROM THE VOTER:

1. Delete the entire rule as unnecessary and inappropriate under OAH standards.

2. The NCSBE again introduces a new term, "Irregularity," which is not found in the NC General Statutes. This term is not needed for rulemaking purposes. Voting and absentee ballot package irregularities are numerous, and most are not included in this rule.

3. Rules are not needed to specify situations where no regulated action or particular processing is needed. There exist countless permutations of voter and election official actions which may not follow proper procedure, but which do not require rulemaking to remedy. The two permutations of improper content preparation for absentee ballot return packages listed in this proposed rule are already understood and do not require rulemaking to manage. These kinds of "irregularities" are best managed through policies or standard operating procedures.

Jim Womack
President, NCEIT
Tel. (919) 770-4783

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jim Womack <james.k.womack@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 11:04 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] NCEIT Comments on Proposed Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 18.0505 IRREGULARITIES THAT REQUIRE FURTHER ACTION

You don't often get email from james.k.womack@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

On behalf of the North Carolina Election Integrity Team (NCEIT), I am submitting the following comments on Proposed Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 18.0505 IRREGULARITIES THAT REQUIRE FURTHER ACTION:

1. This rule is not needed. The term "irregularity" can be eliminated as unnecessary, and the instructions in this proposed rule can be migrated into 08 NCAC 18 .0502 (Curable Deficiencies). Irregularities are simply deficiencies by another name. "Deficiency" is the term used in the NC General Statutes and it should be used in rulemaking for clarity and consistency purposes.

2. Eliminating this rule and migrating the content into .0502 simplifies the process for managing deficiencies in absentee ballot return packages. The processing of curable and non-curable absentee ballot return packages is adequately described in 08 NCAC .0502 and .0503.

Jim Womack
President, NCEIT
Tel. (919) 770-4783

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jim Womack <james.k.womack@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 11:09 PM
To: rrc.comments; Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] NCEIT Comments on Proposed Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0103 ELECTIONEERING ZONE

You don't often get email from james.k.womack@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

On behalf of the North Carolina Election Integrity Team, I am submitting the following comments on Proposed Permanent Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0103 ELECTIONEERING ZONE:

1. This rule is inconsistent with NC General Statute 163-166.4. The proposed rule uses an invented term "electioneering zone" and fails to provide proper reference to the statutorily defined "area for election-related activity." See NC General Statute 163-166.4(b) for clarification.

2. This rule should be deleted or substantially modified because it inappropriately gives a local board of elections the authority to designate any or all areas where electioneering may be restricted outside the statutory "buffer zone," which is inconsistent with U.S. Supreme Court case law (*Burson v. Freeman*, 504 U.S. 191, 210 (1992) "At some measurable distance from the polls, of course, governmental regulation of vote solicitation could effectively become an impermissible burden.").

3. The only "zones" that should be controlled or regulated by election officials are the "buffer zones" in which no electioneering is permitted as per NC General Statute 163-166.4(a).

4. Consistent with NC General Statute 163-166.4(b), the "areas for election-related activity" are designated to provide candidates and campaigns an area adjacent to the voting site in which they have assured authority for passing out literature and making voter contact. In no way are these areas intended to be limited beyond the buffer zone, particularly on public sidewalks and in public parking lots. The general statute clearly does NOT state these "designated areas" are exclusive or that they can be delimited.

Jim Womack
President, NCEIT
Tel. (919) 770-4783

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jane Bilello <jane.bilello@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 2:39 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on Conduct at the Voting Site 10C.0104

You don't often get email from jane.bilello@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Mr. Burgos,

I am formally writing to comment on Conduct at the Voting Site 10C.0104.

- **Terminology Correction** Paragraph (b) improperly uses the term *"electioneering zone,"* a phrase not found in the North Carolina General Statutes or in U.S. Supreme Court precedent. The correct statutory term, as defined in NCGS 163-166.4(b), is *"Area(s) for Election-related Activity."* The rule should be revised to use the proper terminology.

- **Clarification of Noise Standard** Paragraph (c) is acceptable provided it clearly states that noise originating outside the voting enclosure must be **audible inside the enclosure** to qualify as disruptive. Sub-paragraph (c)(1) reflects this standard, but sub-paragraph (c)(2) does not, and therefore requires revision for consistency.

- **Removal of Sub-paragraph (c)(2)** Sub-paragraph (c)(2) should be removed. As written, it risks infringing First Amendment-protected expression. It is overly broad, fails to distinguish between car stereos and other permissible sound-producing devices near voting sites, and could improperly restrict music, bullhorns, or other speech in public areas such as parking lots or sidewalks when such activity does not interfere with voters or the voting process. Regulation of sound in these areas should rely on existing city and county noise ordinances, which already provide the appropriate legal threshold.

Thank you,
Jane Bilello
218 Vincent Place
Hendersonville, NC 28739

--

Jane Bilello
209 986 3845
Chair: Asheville Tea Party
Board Member: North Carolina Election Integrity Team
jane.bilello@gmail.com

As Thomas Jefferson wrote to his friend Richard Price on January 8, 1789: "… whenever the people are well informed they can be trusted with their own government; that whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied on to set them to rights."

Burgos, Alexander N

From: jan4liberty@reagan.com
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 2:39 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Cc: jan4liberty@reagan.com

Subject: [External] Public Input for NC Voting Rule Changes

You don't often get email from jan4liberty@reagan.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Hello Mr Burgos.

I am contacting you to offer public comment regarding the process of updating North Carolina's election laws according to the Administrative Procedure Act (Chapter 150B of the N.C. General Statutes.

Here are the rules I would propose for the Nov 2026 midterms:

1. Mandate **proof of citizenship in order to register to vote**; require those who are already registered to re-register with proof of citizenship.

2. Mandate that the Postal Service refuse delivery of mail-in ballots to any voter not appearing on a specific state voter list that confirms citizenship of the voters listed.

3. **Require photo identification** to cast a ballot - no substitute ID allowed.

4. **No late mail-in ballots**. Main-in ballots will not be counted if received after Nov 3.

5. **Limit mail-in ballots** to overseas military or public service, hospitalized, or who can submit proof of travel plans for being away from their precinct more than 50 miles.

6. **Shorten early voting to just one day before election day**.

For subsequent elections, to avoid all the data breaches and fraud vulnerabilities associated with electronic voting, North Carolina must

1. Ban electronic voting, ballot-counting, and transferring of votes, as 136 other nations have done. Laws for "improved" voting computers only strengthen keeping them. As Elon Musk said "Computers are not meant for voting."

2. Protect the integrity and trust of NC elections with publicly observable hand-counting of paper ballots.

- The United States remains one of the few major democracies in the world that continue to allow computerized vote counting—not observable by the public—to determine the results of its elections [1]. Countries such as Germany [2] Norway [3], Netherlands [4], France [5, 6], Canada [7] , Denmark [8, 9], Italy [10], United Kingdom [11], Ireland [11], Spain [11], Portugal [11], Sweden [11], Finland [11], and most other countries [11].
- If Germany, with a population of 83.5 million can figure out how to do it, so can North Carolina with a population of 11.2 million.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely for True Elections,
Janice Parker
Hendersonville NC 28792

References:

[1] According to a 2020 Gallup World Poll, only 40% of Americans say they are confident in the honesty of U.S. elections. Finland and Norway with 89% of their citizens expressing confidence in the honesty of their elections along with the citizens of 25 other countries have greater confidence in their elections than do Americans.

[2] "Rigged to Work. The voting process in Germany is strictly regulated to rule out any possible election fraud."

[3] "Norwegian votes to be counted manually in fear of election hacking"

[4] "Fearful of Hacking, Dutch Will Count Ballots by Hand"

[5] "Voting in France: Paper ballots, in person, hand-counted"

[6] French Senate: Making the moratorium on use of voting machines permanent. CONTINUE, AS IS, THE MORATORIUM

[7] Canada Elections Act (S.C. 2000, c. 9). Part 12. Counting Votes. Election officer to count votes in the presence of others

[8] Denmark's election law does "not permit electronic voting technologies to be used during voting"

[9] Folketing (Parliamentary) Elections Act, Translation (Consolidated Act No. 1260 of 27 August 2020) CHAPTER I: GENERAL ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS. Counting of the Votes Cast at the Polling Station, Part 9 "[T]he polling supervisors and the appointed electors, … shall count the votes cast at the polling station. The counting is public."

[10] Election of House of Representatives and the Senate of the Republic September 25, 2022. Chapter 23. Ballots counted by officials.

[11] The ACE Electoral Knowledge Network. Vote Counting. Country List. See “Count votes by hand”

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kathy Yurista <kaleidoscope9@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 2:32 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on RULE: 08 NCAC 10C .0101 DEFINITIONS

You don't often get email from kaleidoscope9@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Mr Burgos,

My comment on RULE: 08 NCAC 10C .0101 DEFINITIONS is this.... I've discovered that NC General Statute 163-166.4(b) describes the buffer area around a voting site this way....as the "Area for Election-related Activity". Being this definition is already in state statute, to again keep consistency of terms to lower confusion for the general public, election officials, poll greeters and legislators, it should be used instead of "Electioneering Zone". Keep definitions consistent!

Thank you,
Kathy Yurista
PO Box 781
Hendersonville, NC 28793

--
"Nourishment is one of the greatest gifts we can give ourselves"

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jane Bilello <jane.bilello@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 2:35 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on Voting Site Rules Definitions 10C.0101

You don't often get email from jane.bilello@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Mr. Burgos,

I am formally commenting on Vote Site Rules Definitions 10C. 0101.

The term **"Electioneering Zone"** does not appear anywhere in the North Carolina General Statutes; it is a construct created by the State Board of Elections. As defined in the proposed rule, its broad scope risks conflicting with **First Amendment protections** recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court. In *Burson v. Freeman*, 504 U.S. 191, 210 (1992), the Court warned that "*at some measurable distance from the polls… governmental regulation of vote solicitation could effectively become an impermissible burden*." A definition that extends regulatory authority beyond the statutory buffer zone would therefore raise constitutional concerns.

The term included in the definitions should instead be **"Area(s) for Election-related Activity,"** which is the phrase used in **G.S. 163-166.4(b)**. That statute explicitly identifies the area outside the buffer zone as the space where individuals or groups may distribute campaign literature, place political advertising, solicit votes, or otherwise engage in election-related activity. This statutory term is more accurate, less restrictive, and better aligned with established law governing permissible conduct outside the buffer zone.

Using the term **"Electioneering Zone"** would likely create confusion for election officials and poll greeters, who may mistakenly believe that additional restrictions apply outside the buffer zone. Supreme Court precedent makes clear that while states may impose uniform, narrowly tailored limits **within** a defined buffer zone, they may not extend those restrictions beyond it—particularly on public sidewalks and in public parking areas. Adopting a term that implies broader regulatory authority risks misinterpretation and inconsistent enforcement.

Thank you,
Jane Bilello
218 Vincent Place
Hendersonville, NC 28739

--

Jane Bilello

209 986 3845
Chair: Asheville Tea Party
Board Member: North Carolina Election Integrity Team
jane.bilello@gmail.com

As Thomas Jefferson wrote to his friend Richard Price on January 8, 1789: "… whenever the people are well informed they can be trusted with their own government; that whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied on to set them to rights."

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Agnes Puzak <puzak@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 2:36 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on 08 NCAC 10C .0101 Definitions

You don't often get email from puzak@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

NC General Statutes do not use the term “Electioneering Zone”; the NCSBE introduces this new and unnecessary terminology. Rather than “Electioneering Zone”, “Areas for Election-related Activities” is more consistent with NC General Statute 163-166.4.
The U.S. Supreme Court has clearly ruled that polling place buffer zone restrictions are permissible only to a limited distance from the polling place, and that election-related activity restrictions beyond the buffer zone are neither defensible nor permitted. This would include public sidewalks and public parking lots.
What 08 NCAC 10C.0101 proposes appears to suppress First Amendment rights, that have been affirmed by the Supreme Court.
The definitions used in this rule should be consistent with NC General Statute and constrained by General Statute and Supreme Court rulings.
Agnes Puzak60 Shadow Creek Ct Pinehurst NC 28374

Sent from my iPad

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jane Bilello <jane.bilello@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 2:26 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on Irregularities That Require Further Action 18.0505

You don't often get email from jane.bilello@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

This rule is unnecessary. The term **"irregularity"** can be removed entirely, and the instructions contained in the proposed rule should be incorporated into **08 NCAC 18 .0502 (Curable Deficiencies)**. An irregularity is simply a deficiency by another name, and **"deficiency"** is the term used in the North Carolina General Statutes. Using the statutory term in rulemaking promotes clarity and consistency.

Eliminating this rule and migrating its content into **.0502** streamlines the administration of absentee ballot return packages. The procedures for handling both curable and non-curable deficiencies are already fully addressed in **08 NCAC 18 .0502** and **.0503**, making a separate rule unnecessary.

Thank you,
Jane Bilello
218 Vincent Place
Hendersonville, NC 28739

--

Jane Bilello
209 986 3845
Chair: Asheville Tea Party
Board Member: North Carolina Election Integrity Team
jane.bilello@gmail.com

As Thomas Jefferson wrote to his friend Richard Price on January 8, 1789: "… whenever the people are well informed they can be trusted with their own government; that whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied on to set them to rights."

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jane Bilello <jane.bilello@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 2:21 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on Irregularities that Do Not Require Further Action 18.0504

You don't often get email from jane.bilello@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Mr. Burgos,

This is regarding Irregularities that Do Not Require Further Action 18.0504

1) Delete the entire rule as unnecessary and inappropriate under OAH standards.
2) The NCSBE again introduces a new term, “Irregularity,” which is not found in the NC General Statutes. This term is not needed for rulemaking purposes. Voting and absentee ballot package irregularities are numerous, and most are not included in this rule.
3) Rules are not needed to specify situations where no regulated action or particular processing is needed. There exist countless permutations of voter and election official actions which may not follow proper procedure, but which do not require rulemaking to remedy. The two permutations of improper content preparation for absentee ballot return packages listed in this proposed rule are already understood and do not require rulemaking to manage. These kinds of “irregularities” are best managed through policies or standard operating procedures.

Thank you,
Jane Bilello

218 Vincent Place
Hendersonville, NC 28739

--

Jane Bilello
209 986 3845
Chair: Asheville Tea Party
Board Member: North Carolina Election Integrity Team
jane.bilello@gmail.com

As Thomas Jefferson wrote to his friend Richard Price on January 8, 1789: "… whenever the people are well informed they can be trusted with their own government; that whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied on to set them to rights."

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kathy Yurista <kaleidoscope9@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 2:16 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on "Irregularities" that require attention in 08 NCAC 18.0505

You don't often get email from kaleidoscope9@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Mr Burgos,

Terminology in these "rules" need to be consistent with State Statutes terminology. The word "irregularities" is being used in 08 NCAC 18.0505 when the word "deficiencies" , as in the NC General Statutes should be used for clarities sake.

It seems that eliminating this rule and moving it into .0502 would make the process easier in relation to deficiencies in absentee ballot voter return packages.

Thank you,
Kathy Yurista
PO Bo 781
Hendersonville, NC 28793

--
"Nourishment is one of the greatest gifts we can give ourselves"

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jane Bilello <jane.bilello@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 2:14 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on Recount Guidelines 08 NCAC 09.0106

You don't often get email from jane.bilello@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Mr. Burgos:

I am writing to formally comment on the Recount Guidelines rule, 08 NCAC 09.0106.

Paragraph (d) When a county board adds a third party member (lines 22-25), they are replacing a member. The bipartisan team does not increase to 5. Lines 25 - 28 state: "In no instance shall the county board assign more than two officials to a bipartisan team who are unaffiliated or affiliated with one of the other political parties, and a *bipartisan team of four shall include at least one official from each of the two parties in the State with the largest number of registered voters.*"

The deleted text on line 20 should be reinstated and modified to include input from the two largest political parties in assigning members to teams. There is no reason to exclude input from the political parties. It is an important part of the process to insure inclusion of interested voters from the two largest parties.

On p. 2, line 2: "... if the apparent winner is the apparent loser after the discretionary recount" is clear. The apparent winner turns out to be the loser.

On p. 2, line 10: *"The bipartisan team of two county board members overseeing the recount"* should consist of the bipartisan team who were assigned to tally.

On p. 2, line 19: "... one board member of each political party shall be represented" has a clear reference to county board members in lines 17-18.

Section f, p. 2, lines 11-12: Suggest deleting this sentence: *"For machine recounts of ballot items under the jurisdiction of the State Board, the declaration of the completion of the recount many be delegated by the State Board to the Executive Director of the State Board."* It is inappropriate for the State Board to delegate its responsibility for such delegations to the Executive Director or staff. It is certainly appropriate to recommed to the State Board when completion should be declared.
Delete the discussion of the hand-to- eye recount in this section and move it to 08 NCAC 09.0110 Second Recount. The Recount section is not organized so that all the information on one topic is in one place. The General Guidelines section paragraphs (d) and (f) discuss hand-to-eye recounts while 08 NCAC 09.0110 Second Recount also discuss hand-to-eye recount.

Thank you,Jane Bilello218 Vincent PlaceHendersonville, NC 28739

--

Jane Bilello
209 986 3845
Chair: Asheville Tea Party
Board Member: North Carolina Election Integrity Team
jane.bilello@gmail.com

As Thomas Jefferson wrote to his friend Richard Price on January 8, 1789: "… whenever the people are well informed they can be trusted with their own government; that whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied on to set them to rights."

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jane Bilello <jane.bilello@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 2:10 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on Non-Curable Deficiencies 08 NCAC 18.0503

You don't often get email from jane.bilello@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Mr. Burgos:

I am writing to formally comment on Non-Curable Deficiencies 08 NCAC 18.0503.

Item (a) (9), lines 24-26 describes a curable deficiency, not a non-curable deficiency. This should also be included in 18.0502.

Clarify in this rule that the voter whose absentee ballot was properly requested and whose ballot was returned, enclosed in a sealed ballot envelope in the absentee ballot return package can be accepted, even if there are other (unacceptable) ballots in the absentee ballot return package. These proposed changes better address situations where multiple ballots sometimes are inappropriately returned in a single absentee ballot return package.

Add another non-curable deficiency addressing a non-match of a personal identification number (DL# or last four of SSN) between the voter's application and the voter's voter registration record. Voting absentee by mail is the least observed and secure method for voting.

Special safeguards are needed to ensure legitimacy of the absentee ballot return package. Instructions are needed to address mis-matches of the personal identification

number (PIN) - either the DL# or the SSN-4 - for the voter. PIN mismatches should be non=curable and result in the ballot being spoiled (and re-issued if appropriate).

Thank you.

Jane Bilello
218 Vincent PlaceHendersonville,NC

--

Jane Bilello
209 986 3845
Chair: Asheville Tea Party
Board Member: North Carolina Election Integrity Team
jane.bilello@gmail.com

As Thomas Jefferson wrote to his friend Richard Price on January 8, 1789: "… whenever the people are well informed they can be trusted with their own government; that whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied on to set them to rights."

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jane Bilello <jane.bilello@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 2:30 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on First Recount Rule, 09.0107

You don't often get email from jane.bilello@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Mr. Burgos,

I am writing to formally comment on the First Recount Rule, 09.0107.
Suggestions Section (b): Add a sentence indicating that, in order to remove the risk of machine calibration error affecting the vote count, the tabulator used for the recount should be different from the tabulator used in the original count. Section (c) (1) and (2): Reference to "Rule .0106(d)" should be changed to "08 NCAC 09 .0106(d)" and reference to "Rule .0109" should be changed to "08 NCAC 09. 0109."

Thank you,
Jane Bilello
218 Vincent Place
Hendersonville, NC 28739

--

Jane Bilello
209 986 3845
Chair: Asheville Tea Party
Board Member: North Carolina Election Integrity Team
jane.bilello@gmail.com

As Thomas Jefferson wrote to his friend Richard Price on January 8, 1789: "… whenever the people are well informed they can be trusted with their own government; that whenever things get so far wrong as to attract their notice, they may be relied on to set them to rights."

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Agnes Puzak <puzak@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:46 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comment on 08 NCAC 09.0107 First Recount

You don't often get email from puzak@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Section (b): The tabulator used for the recount should be a different tabulator than that used for the original count. This should reduce the risk of machine tabulation error. Please add this sentence. Thank you for your consideration.Agnes Puzak60 Shadow Creek Ct Pinehurst NC 29374

Sent from my iPad

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Agnes Puzak <puzak@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:48 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comments on 08 NCAC 18.0505 Irregularities that require further action

You don't often get email from puzak@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

This proposed rule is unnecessary. It introduces new terminology ("irregularity"), which is not consistent with NC General statutes. An "irregularity" can be viewed as a deficiency.
08 NCAC 18.0502 deals with curable deficiencies. Merge the content of 0505 into 0502.
Thank you for your consideration.

Agnes Puzak
60 Shadow Creek Ct
Pinehurst NC 28374

Sent from my iPad

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Agnes Puzak <puzak@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:48 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comments on Irregularities that do not require further action 08 NCAC 18.0504

You don't often get email from puzak@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

This proposed rule is unnecessary and should be be deleted. First, the term “irregularity” seems to be new terminology introduced by the NCSBE and one that is absent from NC General Statutes. Second, rules are not needed when no further action is required.

Thank you for your consideration.

Agnes Puzak
60 Shadow Creek Ct
Pinehurst NC 28374

Sent from my iPad

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Agnes Puzak <puzak@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:48 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comments on non-Curable Deficiencies 08 NCAC 18.0503

You don't often get email from puzak@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Sometimes multiple ballots are returned in a single absentee ballot return package, even though this is inappropriate. Acceptable ballots in such a package, e.g. properly requested and enclosed in a sealed ballot envelope, should be accepted. The rule should clearly recognize this situation and handle acceptable ballots appropriately.

A mismatch of the personal identification number-either driver's license number or last 4 digits of the social security number-between the voter's voter registration record and the voter's application should be treated as a non-curable deficiency.
Thank you for your consideration.

Agnes Puzak
60 Shadow Creek Ct
Pinehurst NC 28374

Sent from my iPad

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Agnes Puzak <puzak@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:36 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comments on 08 NCAC 18.0505 Irregularities that require further action

You don't often get email from puzak@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

This proposed rule is unnecessary. It introduces new terminology ("irregularity"), which is not consistent with NC General statutes. An "irregularity" can be viewed as a deficiency.
08 NCAC 18.0502 deals with curable deficiencies. Merge the content of 0505 into 0502.
Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPad

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Agnes Puzak <puzak@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:11 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comments on non-Curable Deficiencies 08 NCAC 18.0503

You don't often get email from puzak@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Sometimes multiple ballots are returned in a single absentee ballot return package, even though this is inappropriate. Acceptable ballots in such a package, e.g. properly requested and enclosed in a sealed ballot envelope, should be accepted. The rule should clearly recognize this situation and handle acceptable ballots appropriately.

A mismatch of the personal identification number-either driver's license number or last 4 digits of the social security number-between the voter's voter registration record and the voter's application should be treated as a non-curable deficiency.
Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPad

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Agnes Puzak <puzak@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:21 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comments on Irregularities that do not require further action 08 NCAC 18.0504

You don't often get email from puzak@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

This proposed rule is unnecessary and should be be deleted. First, the term “irregularity” seems to be new terminology introduced by the NCSBE and one that is absent from NC General Statutes. Second, rules are not needed when no further action is required.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPad

Burgos, Alexander N

From:	Martha Svoboda <svoboda.martha@gmail.com>
Sent:	Saturday, August 15, 2026 11:28 AM
To:	rrc.comments; Rules, Oah
Cc:	Steele, Adam
Subject:	[External] Public comment in opposition to proposed rules regarding photo identification

You don't often get email from svoboda.martha@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

August 15, 2026

TO: North Carolina Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

North Carolina State Board of Elections
430 N. Salisbury St.
Raleigh, NC 27603

(sent via email, as requested)

Re: Public comment in **opposition** to proposed rules regarding photo identification
(08 NCAC 17 .0101 VERIFICATION OF PHOTO IDENTIFICATION DURING IN-PERSON VOTING and 08 NCAC 17 .0109 PHOTO IDENTIFICATION FOR ABSENTEE-BY-MAIL BALLOTS)

Dear Members of the North Carolina Rules Review Commission:

I am a North Carolina resident and have been a registered NC voter since 2000.

I am writing to oppose the proposed Photo ID rule changes to 08 NCAC 17.0101 and 08 NCAC 17.0109 *on the grounds* that these rules are **not reasonably necessary** to implement or interpret **current** state or federal statutes or regulations. *To the contrary*: eliminating the unanimity requirement for rejecting a provisional ballot **runs contrary to state policy** that **encourages bipartisan decision making** by our county boards of elections. N.C.G.S. 163-30 (a) **requires** that the county boards of elections comprise at least two members of different political parties. Retaining the unanimity requirement ensures that a voter's ballot may **only be disqualified if every member agrees**.

These proposed rules would **lower the standard** for rejecting a voter's Photo ID Exception Form from a unanimous county-board decision to a majority vote. That is a **serious change** and one that **contradicts the requirement that a declaration of falsity "be based only on facts and not speculation**."

A Photo ID Exception Form is supposed to protect voters who are eligible to vote but cannot present acceptable photo ID because of a reasonable impediment, disability, illness, lack of transportation, lack of documents needed to get ID, work or school schedule, family responsibilities, religious objection, or a recent natural disaster.

N.C.G.S. 163-166.16(f) **REQUIRES** that, when reviewing a provisional ballot cast with a Photo ID exception form, a County Board of Elections "**shall find** that the provisional ballot is **valid *unless*** the county board has **grounds to believe the affidavit is false.**" The current unanimity requirement is an important safeguard. A voter's ballot should not be rejected unless every county board member agrees, based on facts and not speculation, that the voter's Photo ID Exception Form is false.

Lowering the standard from unanimous agreement to a majority vote makes it more likely that ballots will be rejected along partisan lines. The right to vote should not depend on which party controls a county board.

The rule should make clear that county boards may not reject a Photo ID Exception Form because they personally disagree with the voter's reason, think the voter should have tried harder to get ID, or believe the voter's reason is not "good enough." The **only** question should be whether there is **actual factual evidence** that the voter made a false statement.

At a minimum, this rule should be amended to:

- Retain the unanimous-vote requirement before a ballot cast with a Photo ID Exception Form can be rejected.
- Require clear written findings based on specific facts, not speculation, assumptions, or disagreement with the voter's stated reason.
- Require **meaningful** notice to the voter before the ballot is rejected, including mail (SENT WITHIN AN ADEQUATE TIMEFRAME FOR RECEIPT VIA USPS), email, and phone notice when that information is available.
- Give the voter a **real** opportunity to respond in writing, by phone, remotely, or in person **before** the county board makes any final decision.
- **Prohibit rejection when the voter's explanation is plausible and the board lacks evidence that it is false.**

The current unanimity requirement is a common-sense protection against partisan or mistaken ballot rejection. **Unanimity is a far more compelling indication of factual rather than speculative findings**. It ought to remain the standard as would be in line with the current and proposed requirements that **no ballot be rejected on any uncertain basis**.

Please keep the unanimity protection in place and reject the proposed changes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Martha J. Svoboda, Esq.

Wake County Voter

/s/ Martha J. Svoboda

919-274-9005 (C)
svoboda.martha@gmail.com

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Martha Svoboda <svoboda.martha@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2026 2:02 PM
To: rrc.comments; Rules, Oah
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Public Comment in Opposition to Proposed Rule Changes Re. Absentee Voting

You don't often get email from svoboda.martha@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

August 15, 2026

TO: North Carolina Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

North Carolina State Board of Elections
430 N. Salisbury St.
Raleigh, NC 27603

Re: Public comment in opposition to proposed rules regarding absentee ballots (08 NCAC 18 .0201 Definitions; 08 NCAC 18 .0501 Review for Deficiencies; 08 NCAC 18 .0502 Curable Deficiencies; 08 NCAC 18 .0503 Non-Curable Deficiencies; 08 NCAC 18 .0504 Irregularities That Do Not Require Further Action from the Voter; 08 NCAC 18 .0505 Irregularities That Require Further Action)

Dear Members of the North Carolina State Board of Elections:

I am a North Carolina resident and have been a registered NC voter since 2000.

I am writing to oppose the above-referenced proposed Absentee Voting rules, *most especially* **08 NCAC 18 .0505**.

This rule would require county board staff to contact a voter and require *written* confirmation when certain ballot-envelope issues are found. These include situations where the ballot envelope appears to have been opened and resealed but was received in a sealed outer return envelope, where the ballot is not inside a sealed ballot envelope but the ballot and ballot envelope were received in a sealed outer return envelope, or where the ballot in the envelope is different from the ballot transmitted to the voter.

These situations may involve innocent voter mistakes. They do not necessarily mean the voter is ineligible, that the voter did anything wrong, or that the ballot should be rejected.

The problem with this rule is that it puts the burden back on the voter after the voter has already returned their ballot. **Under current General Statutes, the burden of proof is on the challenger.** *These rules would shift the burden of proof* to the voter to challenge the suspicions of the Board members who brought the challenge. Furthermore, many absentee voters may not receive the notice in time, may not understand what is being asked, may not have reliable mail or email access, or may not be able to respond quickly because of disability, age, displacement, illness, work, school, or caregiving responsibilities.

If a voter returns a ballot in a sealed outer envelope and the county board can determine that the voter is eligible and intended to cast that ballot, the voter should not have to complete extra paperwork just to have the ballot counted. This proposed rule runs the risk of disqualifying ballots cast by eligible voters who clearly communicated their vote and whose ballot was received securely.

Rather, the rule should be changed to:

- Treat these issues as irregularities that should be documented, not as problems requiring voter action, unless there is evidence of tampering or evidence that the voter did not transmit the ballot.
- Move these situations into 08 NCAC 18 .0504 when the ballot was received in a sealed outer envelope.
- Allow the county board to count the ballot if the voter's eligibility, application, and intent can be determined.
- Require voter contact *only* when there is a *genuine* question that cannot be answered from the ballot materials.
- Require county boards to use mail, email, and phone notice **immediately** if voter contact is necessary.
- Allow voters to respond by email, phone, mail, in person, or through a permitted assistant.
- **Prohibit rejection where the voter substantially complied and the issue is not material to whether the voter is eligible to vote.**

The State Board should reject Rule .0505 as written and preserve the existing common-sense approach that counts eligible voters' ballots when technical mistakes do not affect voter eligibility, voter intent, or ballot security.

I would also like to raise objections to the following proposed rule changes:

Re. **08 NCAC 18 .0201 Definitions**

The definitions in this rule should be revised so that ordinary voters can understand the difference between a "deficiency," an "irregularity," a "curable deficiency," and a "non-curable deficiency."

As written, the definitions are technical and may make sense to election lawyers or election administrators, but they are confusing for voters. A voter who receives a notice from the county board should be able to understand (1) what happened, (2) what they need to do, and (3) what will happen if they do not respond.

The definition of "irregularity" is especially important. **The rule should make clear that an "irregularity" is not the same thing as voter fraud, voter ineligibility, or a reason to reject a ballot.** Many irregularities are innocent mistakes that do not affect whether the voter is eligible or whether the voter intended to cast the ballot.

The rule should be amended to state that **technical mistakes should not lead to ballot rejection unless they are material to voter eligibility, ballot security, or voter intent**.

Re. **08 NCAC 18 .0501 Review for Deficiencies**

This rule requires county board staff to review returned absentee ballots for deficiencies or irregularities within one business day.

Prompt review is important, but the rule should include **stronger statewide standards** so voters are treated the same way in every county.

The rule should require county board staff to use uniform statewide forms, uniform written explanations, and uniform procedures when deciding whether something is a deficiency or irregularity. Without clear statewide standards, the same ballot mistake could be treated differently from county to county.

The rule should also require county boards to document the specific reason for any deficiency or irregularity and to keep that documentation with the ballot record. Voters should not lose their ability to cast a ballot based on vague or inconsistent decisions.

Re. **NCAC 18 .0502 Curable Deficiencies**

This rule identifies issues with an absentee ballot that voters can fix.

If this rule is adopted, the State Board should make the cure process as accessible as possible. The rule should require county boards to notify voters by every available method, including mail, email, and phone. If the county board has a voter's phone number or email address anywhere in the voter's record, it should use that information.

The cure notice should be written in plain language. It should clearly say:

- What the problem is.
- What the voter must do to fix it.
- The exact deadline.
- All the ways by which the voter can submit the cure.
- Who may assist the voter.
- A phone number and email address for help.

The rule should also require notices to be available in languages commonly used in the county and in accessible formats for voters with disabilities.

A ballot should not be rejected for a curable deficiency if the voter substantially complies with the cure instructions and the county board can determine that the voter is eligible and intended to cast the ballot.

Re. **08 NCAC 18 .0503 Non-Curable Deficiencies**

This rule lists absentee-ballot issues that would cause the ballot to be spoiled and, if there is enough time, reissued.

This rule should be *narrowed.* **A ballot should be treated as non-curable only when there is no way to determine voter eligibility, voter intent, or ballot security.**

The rule should not classify technical paperwork mistakes as non-curable when the county board can determine (1) who the voter is, (2) that the voter was eligible, and (3) that the voter intended to cast the ballot.

The rule should also require county boards to contact the voter **immediately** by mail, email, and phone before or at the same time the ballot is spoiled and reissued. Voters should not find out too late that their ballot was cancelled.

If the deficiency is discovered close to Election Day, the notice should clearly explain **all** remaining voting options, including early voting, Election Day voting, and any available way to return a reissued absentee ballot on time.

Finally, re. **08 NCAC 18 .0504 Irregularities That Do Not Require Further Action from the Voter**

This rule is a better approach than 08 NCAC 18. 0505 because it recognizes that some technical issues should be documented but should not require the voter to take further action.

As noted above, the State Board should *expand* this rule to include more innocent absentee-ballot mistakes that do not affect voter eligibility or voter intent.

In particular, this rule should include situations where the ballot is received in a sealed outer return envelope, even if there is a technical issue with the inner ballot envelope. **Prior NCSBE guidance treated several of these situations as anomalies, not deficiencies, because the ballot was still received in a sealed envelope.**

The rule should also include situations where two voters in the same household accidentally switch their ballots or ballot envelopes, as long as there are no issues with the applications and the county board can determine which voters cast the ballots. **Prior NCSBE guidance** stated that voters in the same household should *not* have their ballots rejected for that kind of ballot-number mismatch when the mistake is not material to voter eligibility.

The State Board should move these issues into Rule .0504 so voters do not have to complete unnecessary cure paperwork.

Thank you very much for your consideration of my comments regarding these six proposed rule changes.

Respectfully,

Martha J. Svoboda, Esq.

Wake County Voter

/s/ Martha J. Svoboda

919-274-9005 (C)
svoboda.martha@gmail.com

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robin Barefoot <robinbarefoot@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2026 3:15 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking; Robin Barefoot
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - Rule 08 NCAC 09.0107

You don't often get email from robinbarefoot@outlook.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

To the Rules Review Commission:

I am a registered voter in Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed Rule 08 NCAC 09.0107.

The rule violates N.C.G.S. section 10B-21.9(a)(1) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

The rule as written does not include sufficient protections to ensure the BOE personnel conducting a machine recount are chosen and assigned with appropriate assurance for impartiality and preservation of ballots rejected by the tabulator.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. section 150B-21.3(b)(2), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Robin Barefoot
919-612-1629
6726 Johnson Mill Road
Durham NC 27712
Durham County
robinbarefoot@outlook.com

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robin Barefoot <robinbarefoot@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2026 3:07 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking; Robin Barefoot
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - Rule 08 NCAC 17.109

You don't often get email from robinbarefoot@outlook.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

To the Rules Review Commission:

I am a registered voter in Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed Rule 08 NCAC 17.109.

The rule violates N.C.G.S. section 10B-21.9(a)(1) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

The rule as written does not include sufficient protections to ensure the county BOE staff exercise all due diligence and reasonable care to enable the vote to be cast. Every member of the county board must agree that a voter's form is false before their ballot can be rejected. The proposed change would allow a partisan majority to override a dissenting board member's judgment, putting ballots at risk based on board composition rather than the facts of a voter's individual situation.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. section 150B-21.3(b)(2), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Robin Barefoot
919-612-1629
6726 Johnson Mill Road
Durham NC 27712
Durham County
robinbarefoot@outlook.com

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robin Barefoot <robinbarefoot@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2026 3:02 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking; Robin Barefoot
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - Rule 08 NCAC 18.0503

You don't often get email from robinbarefoot@outlook.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

To the Rules Review Commission:

I am a registered voter in Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed Rule 08 NCAC 18.0503.

The rule violates N.C.G.S. section 10B-21.9(a)(1) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

The rule as written does not include sufficient protections to ensure the county BOE staff exercise all due diligence and reasonable care to enable the vote to be cast.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. section 150B-21.3(b)(2), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Robin Barefoot
919-612-1629
6726 Johnson Mill Road
Durham NC 27712
Durham County
robinbarefoot@outlook.com

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Michelle Reid <reidblue84@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2026 11:54 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Reject voting provision changes

You don't often get email from reidblue84@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Good evening ,
The current proposals coming for review
1. Allowing a simply majority versus unanimous decision on provisional ballots is not reasonable and will make political partisanship become more of an influence in the outcome of elections . This is not necessary or reasonable.
2. Penalizing a service man or woman who serve our country because of placement within a envelope is not reasonable and makes it difficult for someone not in the state at the time of election to have their ballot corrected or counted . That is restrictive.
3. Prohibiting sound , is this necessary ? There are usually nothing to attract voters to the polls and nothing to occupy their time as they wait. Why stop encouraging people to vote . Isn't that the purpose of making sure all voices are heard ? This not reasonable or necessary and restrictive .
Please vote no to these provisions

Michelle Reid

Burgos, Alexander N

From:	Al Vos <alvin.vos@gmail.com>
Sent:	Tuesday, July 28, 2026 10:26 PM
To:	rrc.comments
Cc:	SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject:	[External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review Recounts rule 08 NCAC 09 .0106

You don't often get email from alvin.vos@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

To the Rules Review Commission:

I am a registered voter in Wake County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed Recounts rule 08 NCAC 09 .0106

The rule fails the Necessity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(3) because it creates redundant administrative procedures that conflict with existing statutory canvass timelines.

I am a relatively new resident of North Carolina, and I am concerned about the potential for voting to become politicized within this state.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.3(b2), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Alvin Vos
17001 Searstone Drive #305
Cary, NC 27513
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: tim_mckeown <tim_mckeown@protonmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2026 5:44 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Objections (again) to proposed Board of Elections rule 08 NCAC 10C .0104: Conduct at Voting Sites

You don't often get email from tim_mckeown@protonmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Hello,

I'm re-sending this message because my original text neglected to list my name, address, and phone information. I am a register4ed voter in the state of North Carolina.

Timothy J. McKeown
27 Bermouth Court
Durham, NC 27705
919-639-1992 (call or text)

I am objecting to this proposed rule for the following reasons:

1. It singles out political speech as a possible source of disruption in the voting process, when other nearby potentially disruptive sources of sound are ignored. Thus, musical performances, sports events, construction noise, and traffic noise are not addressed. If this rule were really motivated by preserving the tranquility of the polling place, these other sources of noise would have been covered.

2. It adopts a standard for external sound -- "audibility" -- that is plainly inappropriate as a basis for assessing when a sound is disruptive and when it is not.

When is audible noise a hindrance, and when it is a help? Normal face-to-face conversation at a range of about 1 meter typically generates about 60-65 dBA [A-weighted decibels, a measure of sound intensity adjusted to reflect relative loudness perceived by the human ear]. Speech intelligibility begins to degrade when background noise approaches the speech level, and conversation becomes noticeably difficult when background noise is equal to or louder than the talker). However, background noise at a lower range (acoustic engineers suggest 45-48 dBA for open-plan offices or bank lobbies), is actually viewed as **desirable** by them, because "it raises the room's noise floor by a few dB so that speech 15+ feet away becomes unintelligible. The result is **better speech privacy, less distraction, and improved focus**" in such spaces. Thus, the sound of human speech drifting in from outside, if it is not too loud, helps to create the sonic conditions that acoustic engineers seek to create for settings where individuals are engaged in an array of 1-to-1 conversations that they are not interested in sharing widely. Mere audibility of outside speech is

takes place in scattered locations across the country. It is still common enough today that it has been studied systematically and found to be associated with slightly higher levels of voter turn-out (about 3% higher in one unpublished study that I have seen that used a control group of non-festive sites for comparison). I can think of no good reason why such festivals should be suppressed -- unless, of course, you are actually trying to depress turn-out.

References

Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin, *Rude Republic: Americans and Their Politics in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton University Press, 2000).

Richard Franklin Bensel, *The American Ballot Box in the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Jon Grinspan, *The Virgin Vote: How Young Americans Made Democracy Social, Politics Personal, and Voting Popular in the Nineteenth Century* (University of North Carolina Press, 2016).

Sent with Proton Mail secure email.

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Michelle Kurtz <mkurtz8@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2026 5:39 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from mkurtz8@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Members of the North Carolina Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina registered voter with some concerns regarding the proposed changes to the election rules.

I am concerned about the proposed change regarding provision ballots. The change from requiring unanimous agreement to reject a provisional ballot to a majority rule causes me concern. By making this change, we open ourselves to accepting or rejecting ballots based on political affiliations. Our elections must remain fair and independent of political influences and loyalties.

I am also deeply concerned about the proposal regarding absentee ballots. Requiring a specific order and type of envelope appears to cause an unnecessary impediment to voting. Has there been a demonstrated need for this change? It seems arbitrary and a burden to those who vote absentee. In a state with a large military presence, this seems especially punitive for our service members.

Thank you for your time to consider my comments.

Michelle Kurtz
Raleigh, NC

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Naomi M <hipvegi@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2026 3:45 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Opinion on upcoming changes

You don't often get email from hipvegi@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

1) I think changing the standard to majority rule for provisional votes is a bad idea for NC and will cause unnecessary barriers to voting.
2) I also think the change to absentee ballots without the inner envelope is bad and creates unnecessary barriers for voters.
3) I think that limiting having music at voting events is bad for NC voters.
I urge a no vote on these changes.

Naomi Moore
51 Wentworth Ave
Asheville, NC 28803
Buncombe County resident age 59, registered voter
828-241-7451

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Michelle Armour <micharmour@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2026 1:01 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from micharmour@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Please vote NO:
Reasonably necessary or create confusion

Proposal 1: Provisional ballots rejection should stay as a unanimous vote it is not reasonably necessary to change

Proposal 2: Creates confusion and unnecessary barriers to participation for military and overseas voters

Proposal 3: Restricts voter participation without sufficient justification/ amplified sound/music near the polling places. It is not necessary. This makes it more welcoming and fun while waiting in line to vote which encourages voting.

Sincerely,
Michelle Armour
908.578.1753
www.linkedin.com/in/micharmour

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kay Day <kaywilsonday@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2026 12:04 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Proposed rule changes, Board of Elections

You don't often get email from kaywilsonday@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Good Morning.

I would like to submit comments about the three current rule changes proposed by the NC Board of Elections.

1- Challenged ballots

I feel like our right and duty to vote will be compromised by this rule change. I think that ONLY when EVERYONE on the board agrees that the provisional ballot cannot be accepted should it be thrown out. This is a very serious action, possibly depriving a US citizen of their right to vote, and it should not be taken lightly, nor should it be able to be done by merely a subset of members of the board. This is the kind of action that disenfranchises voters and makes them distrust the system.

2-Absentee ballot packaging requirements

As Americans, we are not used to having to plan vacations around voting. We can vote by mail. We are not afraid that we will not be able to vote if we take a job with our US company overseas. We can vote by mail. Our military. while deployed or doing work for us overseas do not worry that they will not be allowed to participate in elections back home. They can vote by mail. Even though this proposed change does not preclude mail-in voting, it does create procedural difficulties. To require that the ballot needs to go in a particular envelope, then be sealed, and then be put in another envelope, seems unnecessarily cumbersome. Especially for service members in wartime. These picky details for their ballot to be accepted (not rejected) seem like another barrier to voting. We should make voting as easy as possible as long as the person is qualified to vote in the US, in NC. To put additional rules around how to handle the paperwork makes it sound like the BOE is trying to find ways to NOT allow people to vote. I don't want to feel that way, but as long as the ballot is in the envelope, it should be accepted! As a matter of fact, if it is put in ANY envelope it should be accepted. This is sneaky and mean-spirited. Not meant to improve the voting experience and voting availability for all North Carolinians.

3-Restrictions on Amplified Sound

I don't even know what to say about this. The BOE needs to keep their minds on bringing voters to the polls. Not about some music outside the polls. In my opinion, if the polling place and the poll officials do not have a problem with the sound, if THEY do not consider it disruptive to THEIR polling location, then it should be acceptable. To think that this is all the BOE needs to think about is unbelievable. Once again, they need to focus on making voting in NC as easy as possible. That is how it used to be.

Burgos, Alexander N

From: farmerfamily3@verizon.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2026 11:50 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public comments on voting changes

You don't often get email from farmerfamily3@verizon.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I am writing to urge you all to NOT put into place the changes proposed to NC voting. In particular, changing the requirements for voting by mail creates a a voting problem for folks over seas including MILITARY that may not have time to correct any error of a ballot not in the envelope. Also, changing the rule to require majority votes over unanimous votes to dismiss a provisional ballot is ridiculous. Lowering the standard is not going to do anything but cause more ballots to be dismissed causing more loss of voting.

Please reject all three proposals. We do NOT need any further barriers to a safe and legal and CONSTITUTIONAL right to vote.

Kari Farmer
Pisgah Forest NC

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Beverly Bard <bgbard@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2026 11:02 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Voting Rules

[You don't often get email from bgbard@hotmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Rules Committee,
Please make voting easier, not harder. Mistakes are at .001%!
Thank you,
Beverly Jo Bard
2205 Delaine Point,
High Point, NC 27265
Sent from my iPhone

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jody Neill-Shaughnessy <jlneillshau@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2026 10:05 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Proposed Voting Changes

You don't often get email from jlneillshau@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a voter from Charlotte. I am writing today to respectfully ask you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.

I am especially concerned about the proposal regarding having a majority vote vs a unanimous vote to throw out a ballot because I feel like it could cause contested ballots, longer waits for results, and inaccurate election results. We should have very stringent requirements for eliminating ballots and not lowered standards. I think about everything that happened with the Allison Riggs/Jefferson Griffin case and we want to continue to hold high standards and make sure every valid vote counts.

Thank you for your time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Jody Neill-Shaughnessy
Charlotte, NC

--

Jody Neill-Shaughnessy

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Betsy Richter <bhrichter2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 8:25 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Voting changes

You don't often get email from bhrichter2@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Subject: Strong Opposition to Proposed Election Rule and Voting Changes

I am writing to express my strong opposition to three proposed changes to North Carolina's election rules. These modifications threaten voter access, fairness, and the integrity of our democratic process.

First, I object to reducing the voting requirement to a simple majority for the election board to discard a provisional ballot. Currently, tossing a provisional ballot requires a unanimous, 100% vote from the board. Because North Carolina's 100 county boards consist of three Republicans and two Democrats, lowering this threshold to a simple majority removes the vital safeguard of bipartisan consensus. It allows a single political party to invalidate ballots unilaterally.

Second, I oppose the proposal to reject mail-in ballots solely because they are not placed in the exact correct envelope within the state's complex two-envelope system. Implementing this rule without providing a chance to cure the mistake will disproportionately disenfranchise military personnel stationed abroad, overseas workers, and elderly voters. Valid ballots cast by eligible citizens should not be thrown out over minor administrative technicalities.

Third, I object to the prohibition of amplified sound outside polling places. Waiting lines at busy voting precincts can be long and chaotic. Amplified sound is a critical tool used by non-partisan volunteers and election workers to communicate essential voting instructions, directional information, and safety updates to citizens standing outside in line. Banning it creates unnecessary confusion and hinders efficient line management.

I urge you to reject these restrictive measures and instead focus on policies that protect bipartisan oversight, preserve the military vote, and keep polling locations accessible for all North Carolinians.

Thank you for your time and your dedication to fair elections.

Sincerely,

Betsy Richter

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Karen Jones <ksjones610@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 7:12 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on proposed election rules

You don't often get email from ksjones610@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,
I am a North Carolina voter, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.
1 am particularly concerned about the proposal regarding port dialog cancelling mail in ballots for simply not having the inner envelope because people who are voting absentee will not be present in order to correct any mistake. This is an easy thing to forget to do and I believe cancelling someone's vote for simply not having an inner envelope would have devastating consequences.
I do not believe this proposed rule is reasonably necessary because
I am also concerned that this proposal could create confusion or unnecessary barriers.
Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.
Respectfully,
Karen Jones
Wake County Voter

Sent from my iPhone

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Alishia Jones <alishiajones09@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 6:31 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Necessity of Proposed Rules

You don't often get email from alishiajones09@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonably necessary or would create confusion for voters before approving them.

The North Carolina State Board of Elections has proposed harmful rule changes that could:

• Allow county boards to reject certain ballots along party lines:
• This change risks undermining the impartiality of our election process. By opening the door for partisan decisions on ballot acceptance, it could erode public trust in the fairness of our elections. There is no clear evidence that such a rule is needed, and it would likely lead to increased disputes, delays, and confusion for voters whose ballots are subjected to subjective scrutiny.

• Limit certain types of constitutionally protected gatherings at polling sites:
• Restricting gatherings at polling places may infringe upon rights guaranteed by the Constitution, such as freedom of assembly and speech. Existing regulations already ensure safety and order at polling sites; further limitations are unnecessary and could discourage civic engagement. These restrictions would create uncertainty about what is permitted, leading to confusion for voters and volunteers alike.

• Make it harder to vote by mail (and harder for those ballots to count):
• Additional barriers to mail-in voting are not justified, especially when current procedures are already robust and secure. Making it more difficult for voters to cast ballots by mail and have them counted would disproportionately affect those who rely on this method, such as seniors, people with disabilities, and those unable to visit polling sites in person. This change could result in a lower voter turnout and unnecessary confusion regarding the mail-in voting process.

I do not believe that the proposals are reasonably necessary and will create confusion. I am particularly concerned that these changes would undermine confidence in our elections and make it harder for North Carolinians to participate in the democratic process.

I am urging the Review Commission to REJECT these anti-voter rules and instead protect voters' rights.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Diana Shepard <shepdmv@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 6:02 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] New board of elections proposals

You don't often get email from shepdmv@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I would like to comment on these three proposals

Regarding the provisional ballots, I don't believe that this is reasonably necessary

Regarding envelope issues, I feel this proposal will create confusion and unnecessary barriers for our military and overseas voters. What a horrible thing to do to our military right before elections!

Regarding prohibiting amplified sound, is this reasonably necessary? For some voters, this is an opportunity to come together and enjoy that time standing in long lines. This sounds like a rule targeting certain voters for no reasonable purpose.

Please consider how these changes will adversely affect voters in North Carolina and our military overseas. This is not what America is about.

Thank you for your attention before you consider these proposals.

Diana Shepard, constituent
3704 Albritton Dr, Durham, NC 27705

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Ann Moss Joyner <annmossjoyner@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 5:31 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] voter regs changes: public comment

You don't often get email from annmossjoyner@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.

I am particularly concerned about the proposal regarding provisional ballots and the proposal regarding absentee ballots because I don't think that either is necessary or helpful.

I do not believe this proposed rule is reasonably necessary we have not had issues with the current system.

I am also concerned that this proposal could create confusion or unnecessary barriers.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Respectfully,

Ann Joyner
Mebane, North Carolina

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Janet Elmo <janetgelmo@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 5:18 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules Changes

You don't often get email from janetgelmo@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission:

I am a North Carolina voter and have been made aware of three proposed election rules. I respectfully ask if the three are truly and reasonably necessary. I believe they will create confusion among voters, and in the case of the envelope within an envelope, will likely disinfranchise our military members who live out of state or the country.

I also don't understand why you are concerned about amplified sounds at election sites. There's an old saying I'm sure you know - if it ain't broke, don't fix it. And the three proposals you are considering seem very clear to me that you're trying to fix something that's not broken.

Please vote these proposals down in the name of fair and honest elections.
Thank you,
Janet Elmo
Durham

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Margaret Larson <margielarson61@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 4:11 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Objection to proposed voting changes

You don't often get email from margielarson61@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I am a registered voter in North Carolina. I strenuously object to the proposed changes to which votes are accepted and which could now be excluded. This is nothing more than an effort to disenfranchise voters for nonsensical reasons.
Every member of this committee should be held legally liable for criminal prosecution if they seek to silence the voters of this state.

Margaret Larson
Fayetteville NC

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Susan Berland <susanberland@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 4:08 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] New voting rules

You don't often get email from susanberland@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I'm writing to strongly object to all three of the new voting rules. This is not playing fair and will disenfranchise way too many voters. They are totally unnecessary.

Warm regards,

Susan Berland

She/Her/Hers

415.987-3194

Burgos, Alexander N

From: T BLAINE <tgmblaine@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 3:44 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Proposed New Voting Rules

[You don't often get email from tgmblaine@aol.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

As a resident of NC, zip code 28227, I object to the proposed new voting rules that would allow a simple majority, rather than a 100% vote, to reject a mail-in ballot. The new rules also would prevent citizens from overseas the ability to cure their ballot for minor technicalities, such as envelope placement. In addition, the proposal to forbid amplified sound outside of polling places is unnecessary and instructive upon loc government as municipalities have their own sound ordinances.

Teresa M Blaine
4821 Oberwald Pl
Charlotte NC 28227

Sent from my iPhone

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Candace Smith <candacesmith7@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 2:38 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] New proposed voting rules

[You don't often get email from candacesmith7@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I strongly object to the new voting rules.

These new rules will be extremely unfair to our military personnel and persons in overseas jobs, as well as others. With the complicated two-envelope NC system, these rules will hamper, or even eliminate, their opportunity to cure otherwise perfect ballots. Thus cheating them of their votes.

The decisions by the NC election board for tossing ballots need to be unanimous, not reduced to a majority. Leave it as it is, 100% of the board members.

Do not pass these new rules. They are not in the best interest of NC voters.

Candace Smith
High Point, NC
Sent from my iPhone

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jen Gorham <sunsethouse@triad.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 2:24 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] NO TO PROPOSED VOTING RULES

You don't often get email from sunsethouse@triad.rr.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Rules Committee,

Please vote no to proposed voting rules.

Jennifer Gorham

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Natalie <davisnsma2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 1:33 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from davisnsma2@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules and Review Commission,

My name is Natalie Davis, and I'm a North Carolina voter. I'm writing to respectfully ask you to consider whether the proposed election rules are reasonably necessary and whether they would create confusion for voters before you approve them.

I do not believe the proposed rule to limit noise outside of polling areas is necessary because often times inspiring music is played and is part of the voting experience. There isn't a need for this limitation, and it only limits voting activity and participation.

I am also concerned this proposal would create confusion and unnecessary barriers for military and overseas voters due to the envelop rule. If overseas voters make a mistake because the new rule is inherently complicated stuffing envelops inside envelops, then they wouldn't have a chance to remedy it and have their vote count.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Respectfully,
Natalie Davis
Newton, North Carolina

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Richard Henrich <richardhenrich@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 11:34 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Proposals

You don't often get email from richardhenrich@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

To whom it may concern,

I have an issues with the proposed changes to the voting process.

The first proposal " to allow a majority to remove ballot" I do not think this is necessary.

The second proposal "to not count ballots that are not mailed in the proper envelope" would not allow a person especially our military personnel overseas to correct any problem.

The third proposal "not allow amplified voices around poll places" I believe is a huge over reach. Being a poll worker, if there is a problem, the chief judge is move than capable of handling it.

Thank you

Richard Henrich
312 Crescent St.
Saluda, NC 28773

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Nancy HM <nhughesmiller@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 11:34 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from nhughesmiller@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.

I am particularly concerned about the proposal regarding a new count of members to approve the rule change that might make one party have ultimate “say” - it doesn’t need to change and causes much confusion and DISTRUST! Provisional ballots are working FINE NOW- do not change the rule! And mail in voting SHOULD NOT BECOME HARDER- this envelope and date change DISENFRANCHISES MANY VOTERS - and will suppress people’s voices in this election. Do not eliminate the right of people to play music at polling places because it has proven to be popular and does not affect anyone’s right to vote. It provides a calming backdrop to a potentially stressful and time consuming experience.

I do not believe these proposed rules are reasonably necessary because the existing rules were developed in a fair bipartisan manner. And these changes will sow confusion and uncertainty and give the party in power NOW (GOP) UNFAIR ADVANTAGE!

Again I am also concerned that these proposals will create confusion, unnecessary barriers and only benefit ONE PARTY.

MAKE NO NEW RULES FOR OUR UPCOMING ELECTIONS! You will be seen as PARTISAN HACKS with ALLEGIANCE TO Trump VS DEMOCRACY!!!

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Respectfully,

Nancy Hughes Miller
Cary, North Carolina

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Francene Greene <fvgreene@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2026 9:27 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from fvgreene@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter, and with much respect I am asking you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.

I am particularly concerned about the proposal regarding how provisional ballots are rejected. The current rule requires EVERY member of the board to agree. The proposed change recommends a SIMPLE majority which goes AGAINST the legal voter.

I do not believe this proposed rule is reasonably necessary because it makes it too easy to disqualify a legitimate provisional ballot/vote, thus denying a voter of their fair and legal right to vote.

I am also concerned that the multiple envelope proposal for mail in ballots of those North Carolinians, like service members, could create confusion or unnecessary barriers by the specifics of envelopes (size, addressing, etc.) and even access to the specified envelopes (like costs). Our service members, of all people, do NOT deserve this undue burden in exercising their right to vote.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Respectfully,

Francene V. Greene
Concord, North Carolina

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Susan Rodriguez <susan.rodriguez2@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 10:28 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Objection to proposed rules

[You don't often get email from susan.rodriguez2@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I have read the proposed rules regarding reducing to a simple majority all provisional ballots, mail in ballots in incorrect envelopes and forbidding amplified sound outside polling places.

I strongly disagree with all three proposed rules and believe they are a way to discourage voters, especially those overseas, from voting.
You are making the rules for your own convenience and not for the convenience of voters.

Re-think what you are doing, which is harming voters who have used their rights to choose their candidate.

I hope you choose the right thing. We also have the power to vote you out. Remember that.

Susan Rodriguez
Sent from my iPhone

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Gerald Wade <gnacwade@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2026 10:12 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Rules NC RULES REVIEW

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

This email is in request to make known and clarify some of the voting procedures that will be voted on July 30th.
1). Provisional ballots and their acceptance. Previously it was unanimously agreed or rejected on acceptance; now the board of elections want to make it 'majority vote'. Question - is this necessary or will it cause more confusion?

2) Absentee ballots. (Voting for military, overseas and mail voters) The process of - ballot to official ballot envelope to return mail envelope could cause barriers if the person is unable to correct a mistake. Would the new proposal by the board cause more barriers and confusion for military and overseas voter?

3) Actvities near polling places -prohibiting amplified music ie "souls to the polls" which provides a calming effect while people stand in long lines to vote Question is this proposal necessary; has it been a demonstrated need for this change or does it restrict voting activity without justification?
Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Agnes Puzak <puzak@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:11 PM
To: Burgos, Alexander N
Subject: [External] Comments on non-Curable Deficiencies 08 NCAC 18.0503

You don't often get email from puzak@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Sometimes multiple ballots are returned in a single absentee ballot return package, even though this is inappropriate. Acceptable ballots in such a package, e.g. properly requested and enclosed in a sealed ballot envelope, should be accepted. The rule should clearly recognize this situation and handle acceptable ballots appropriately.

A mismatch of the personal identification number-either driver's license number or last 4 digits of the social security number-between the voter's voter registration record and the voter's application should be treated as a non-curable deficiency.
Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my iPad

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Teresa Sowinski <t.sowinski@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 10:25 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Please reject new unfair voting rules

You don't often get email from t.sowinski@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I am concerned about two of the recent changes to rules regarding voting by the State Board of Elections.

1. The ID Exception Form for a Provisional Ballot--changing the old rule of a unanimous decision by the Board in favor of a decision by a simple majority is Not Reasonably Necessary. With a 5 member board this allows for a partisan vote which is unacceptable and does not justly represent the citizens of North Carolina. Voting in North Carolina should not be influenced by political parties.

2. The rule change for rejection of a mail in ballot because of an error in the voter's usage of the two envelopes--Not using the inner envelope properly and/ or in the correct order, creates confusion. There is not enough time allotted for absentee voters to correct their error and many voters could be confused by the extra envelope. Rejecting their votes because of a tedious design is not reasonably necessary. Verification by a pole worker from each party and a supervisor is appropriate. Voting needs to be simple for everyone.

Your diligence in making North Carolina's voting procedures a fair, nonpartisan, and honest system is expected of individuals holding your position. Our forefathers expected integrity above party lines. Voters of North Carolina do as well.

Teresa Sowinski
191 Old North State Lane
New London, NC 28127

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Stephanie Mood <stephanie.mood@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 9:47 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Objection to proposed rule changes by the NC Board of Electiond

You don't often get email from stephanie.mood@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

North Carolina Rules Revision Committee,

I'm writing to address and voice my opposition to the unnecessary and unreasonable changes recently put forth by our State Board of Elections.

1. Addressing the ID Exception Form for a Provisional Ballot: changing the old rule from a unanimous decision by the board to a simple majority vote is reasonably unnecessary. Our U.S. Constitution including several Amendments and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 protect our right to vote. Furthermore, our U.S Constitution requires that all criminal trial juries must vote unanimously to find a defendant guilty. Why would it be any different if our constitutional right to vote is challenged? This isn't a vote by the church ladies bazaar or the school PTA on whether to offer brownies or cupcakes at the annual bake sale. THIS is someone's protected right to vote! Why would we allow that to be decided by a simple majority? Is this an attempt to allow partisan decisions be made regarding our votes? Neither party should have that influence. The safeguard of a unanimous vote should remain in effect to protect our right to vote. The change to a simple majority vote rather than a unanimous vote is NOT reasonably necessary.

2. Addressing the rule change for rejecting absentee ballots (or mail-in ballots): the proposed change to reject a ballot that isn't in the correct inner mailer, sealed, and placed in yet another sealed envelop creates confusion. Whew, that was confusing just to write! This tedious process places unnecessary burden and confusion on our senior citizens and those with physical disabilities. It places an unnecessary and confusing burden on our courageous Service Members deployed abroad protecting our interests. We should be protecting their right to vote at all costs. There is little time for these individuals to correct their absentee ballot should they make a miss step in the process and it's certainly unreasonable to tell them to vote in person. Common sense should be used by the county board of elections in determining the intention of these individuals to vote absentee. Exercising our right to vote needs to be simple for everyone. Again, this is unnecessary and confusing.

3. Addressing amplified music at polling sites: prohibiting amplified music near polling sites is unnecessary and creates confusion. Many individuals use music to celebrate their right to vote. How would anyone outside a polling site know if they are being too loud? There is no clarity to this rule and leaves it to complete subjectivity. I can't think of any reason why this would impact voters headed to the polls other than to allow poll workers to turn them away. This appears as a blatant attempt to discourage and stifle voting, especially for minority and young voters. This directly violates voting rights. Again, this is unnecessary and creates confusion.

I urge the Rules Revision Committee to reject these changes on the grounds they are reasonably unnecessary and create confusion.

Respectfully,
Stephanie Mood
Montgomery County, NC, Resident

Sent from Gmail Mobile Please excuse typos and autocorrect errors

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kathleen Langerman <klangerman@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 10:30 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public comment on proposed election rules

You don't often get email from klangerman@bellsouth.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.

I am particularly concerned about the proposal regarding the voting sites on college campuses because I feel this would be done in an effort to dilute the vote. I have been that college student whose voting site was across town and I had no car. It made me feel badly that I had to take extra steps to vote because the college voting site was taken away.

I do not believe this proposed rule is reasonably necessary because It is disenfranchises those who have no way to get across town to vote.

I am also concerned that this proposal could create confusion or unnecessary barriers by not taking into account those who have no transportation.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Respectfully,

Kathleen Langerman, RN, MSN, CNOR
Cornelius, North Carolina

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Pat Hansmeyer <phansmeyer@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 9:18 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Proposed rules

You don't often get email from phansmeyer@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

1. A simple majority to reject provisional ballots rather than the entire cohort is suspect at the very least, and deliberately partisan and flawed at the worst. There is no need for this.

2. If eligible voters outside NC send in ballots that are complete including ID, the second proposed rule would invalidate them if they weren't in the correct envelope. They would be denied the chance to cure the situation because of their distance. This includes military, people who travel because of their jobs, and more.

3. The third proposed rule is to ban amplified sound at polling places. We are talking music here people! Music while people wait in long lines because there aren't enough polling places. This is downright ridiculous.

My hope is when you review these proposed rules, you will see them as unnecessary and for what they really are, harassment of voters.

Patricia G Hansmeyer
3627 Single Leaf Ct.
High Point, NC 27265

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Pat Hansmeyer <phansmeyer@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 9:18 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Proposed rules

You don't often get email from phansmeyer@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

1. A simple majority to reject provisional ballots rather than the entire cohort is suspect at the very least, and deliberately partisan and flawed at the worst. There is no need for this.

2. If eligible voters outside NC send in ballots that are complete including ID, the second proposed rule would invalidate them if they weren't in the correct envelope. They would be denied the chance to cure the situation because of their distance. This includes military, people who travel because of their jobs, and more.

3. The third proposed rule is to ban amplified sound at polling places. We are talking music here people! Music while people wait in long lines because there aren't enough polling places. This is downright ridiculous.

My hope is when you review these proposed rules, you will see them as unnecessary and for what they really are, harassment of voters.

Patricia G Hansmeyer
3627 Single Leaf Ct.
High Point, NC 27265

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Debbie Roland <primroseave@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 8:24 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Voting Changes

You don't often get email from primroseave@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I am concerned about two of the recent changes to rules about voting by the State Board of Elections.

(1) Voting in any state, including North Carolina should not be influenced by political parties! Voting is a privilege given to **ALL** citizens. In the case of a question about the ID Exception Form for a Provisional ballot, changing the old rule of a unanimous decision by the Board in favor of a decision by a simple majority is NOT REASONABLY NECESSARY NOR FAIR!

(2) Concerning the rule change of the rejection of a mail in ballot because of an error in the voter's usage of the two envelopes, for example not having used the inner envelope properly and in the correct order, creates confusion. Military voters overseas have no opportunity to correct their errors. Seniors could be confused by the extra envelope. Rejecting their votes because of a tedious design is not reasonably necessary nor fair. Common sense should be used by the county board of elections in determining the intention of the voter to vote absentee. **Voting should be simple for everyone!**

Thank you for your consideration.

Deborah Roland
108 Old North State Ln
New London, NC 28127

Burgos, Alexander N

From: W W <wellwan99@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 6:01 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from wellwan99@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Board Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed voting rule changes.

Please find my comments on the specific areas below:

- Provisional Ballots: The current rule for challenged ballots should remain in place to maintain the integrity of the process. Lowering this standard is not necessary.
- Absentee Ballots: The proposed packaging requirements create confusion and unnecessary barriers for military and overseas voters.
- Activities at Polling Places: The restrictions on amplified sound are not necessary, as there has been no demonstrated need for this change.

Sincerely,
Wanda Maddox

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kim Bost <treblemakermom@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 5:38 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Recent rule changes voted on the by the State Board of Elections

[You don't often get email from treblemakermom@aol.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I want to raise concerns about two of the recent changes to rules about voting by the State Board of Elections.

1. In the case of a question about the ID Exception Form for a Provisional Ballot, changing the old rule of an unanimous decision by the county board in favor of a decision by a simple majority is Not Reasonably Necessary. Voting in North Carolina should not be influenced by political parties.

2. Concerning the rule change of the rejection of a mail in ballot because of an error in the voter's usage of the two envelopes, for example not having used the inner envelope properly and in the correct order, Creates Confusion. Military voters overseas have no opportunity to correct their error. Seniors could be confused by the extra envelope. Rejecting their votes because of a tedious design is not reasonably necessary. Common sense should be used by the county board of elections in determining the intention of the voter to vote absentee. Voting needs to be simple for everyone.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kimberly Bost
175 Pattersons Bridge
New London, NC 28127

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Susan S. <ssaenger2@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 5:06 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Proposed rules

You don't often get email from ssaenger2@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Subject: Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.

I am particularly concerned about the proposal regarding absentee ballots because it seems unnecessary and has the potential to disenfranchise voters, particularly military personnel serving overseas.

I do not believe this proposed rule is reasonably necessary because it doesn't do anything to prevent someone from illegally voting, it simply enforces a complicated and burdensome process.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Respectfully,

Susan Saenger
Durham, North Carolina

Susan Saenger
https://www.facebook.com/susan.saenger.2025

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mary Stoudemire Clark <maryclarksec@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 4:22 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from maryclarksec@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters.

I am particularly concerned with the rule regarding whether a provisional ballot is rejected because it changes the balance of voices on the county board to eliminate a provisional vote.

I am concerned that the revised rules could cause confusion among voters who need to use a provisional ballot on whether their vote will be counted.

It could create an unnecessary barrier for those voters who, usually through no fault of their own, find it necessary to use a provisional ballot. The current rule is more amenable to the voter ensuring all voices on the board are heard.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Respectfully,
Mary Stoudemire Clark
Davidson, North Carolina

Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kathryn Kantz <lofquist14kantz@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 1:31 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Pending voting rules

You don't often get email from lofquist14kantz@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Sirs:
I am fully against each of the proposed three rules changes.

1. Rejection of provisional ballots by a majority only - not necessary and creates an opportunity for voter suppression through political activity.
2. Making people put their ballot in another envelope - creates confusion and unnecessary impediments to overseas and absentee voters.
3. No noise in polling places - Why, just why? This is so unnecessary - have voters been complaining that they don't like the musical choices being played? Probably not. How does music interfere with voting? Absolutely not. It's like a "Karen" has shown up at a block party.

Please do not waste time putting ridiculous and confusing rules in place.

Kathryn Kantz
Sylva, NC
Jackson County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robyn Lay <robyntlay@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 11:05 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment Proposed Rules Changes

You don't often get email from robyntlay@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter and I respectfully ask you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonable necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.

I am particularly concerned about the proposals around absentee and provisional ballots.

I do not believe moving from unanimous to majority agreement in tossing provisional ballots when there is a question about a voter ID exception form is reasonably necessary, and only serves to reduce voter protections when a majority rather than unanimity is required.

Proposals to reject absentee ballots that may not be enclosed in the inner envelope before being mailed in the outer envelope may cause confusion and barriers to active duty military, overseas residents, or other eligible voters being able to reasonably cast and or cure their ballots.

I am deeply concerned with these changes and thank you for considering my public comment ahead of your next meeting.

Respectfully,

Robyn Lay
Durham, NC

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Karen <ktpack@windstream.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 10:13 AM
To: David Twiggs
Cc: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Re: 3 proposed rule changes

[You don't often get email from ktpack@windstream.net. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Perfect!
Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 26, 2026, at 9:55 AM, David Twiggs <dtwiggs2@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> 1 - rejection of provisional ballot by simple majority vote - This is not necessary and unduly burdens voters right to vote
>
> 2- Absentee ballot not submitted inside ballot envelopes is not necessary and unduly burdens voters burdens voters right to vote
>
> 3 - stopping free speech by amplification control outside the polls. This is unconstitutional and is outside the jurisdiction of the election board past it's boundary
>
> These rule changes are not reasonably necessary and they create undue confusion!
>
> Vote no on all 3 please.
>
> Sent from my IPhone
> David Twiggs
> Cell Phone # - 865-300-2154
> dtwiggs2@gmail.com
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

Burgos, Alexander N

From: David Twiggs <dtwiggs2@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2026 9:55 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Karen Pack
Subject: [External] 3 proposed rule changes

[You don't often get email from dtwiggs2@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

1 - rejection of provisional ballot by simple majority vote - This is not necessary and unduly burdens voters right to vote

2- Absentee ballot not submitted inside ballot envelopes is not necessary and unduly burdens voters burdens voters right to vote

3 - stopping free speech by amplification control outside the polls. This is unconstitutional and is outside the jurisdiction of the election board past it's boundary

These rule changes are not reasonably necessary and they create undue confusion!

Vote no on all 3 please.

Sent from my IPhone
David Twiggs
Cell Phone # - 865-300-2154
dtwiggs2@gmail.com

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Teresa Outlaw <teresaoutlaw@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 11:58 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from teresaoutlaw@icloud.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether the new proposed rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.

I am particularly concerned about the proposed **Voter ID Exception Rules** and the **Absentee (Mail) Ballot Review Rules** because they increase the discretion of county election boards to reject ballots and may result in eligible voters being treated differently depending on where they live or how local officials interpret the rules.

I do not believe these proposed rules are reasonably necessary because North Carolina already has laws governing voter identification and absentee voting. Rather than creating new procedures that expand opportunities to reject ballots for technical reasons, our election system should prioritize ensuring that every eligible voter's ballot is counted while maintaining existing safeguards against fraud.

I am also concerned that these proposals could create confusion or unnecessary barriers by making the voting process more complicated for voters who rely on absentee ballots or who qualify for a voter ID exception. **Older adults, individuals with disabilities, military and overseas voters, and others who face legitimate challenges could be disproportionately affected.** Even if only a small number of ballots are impacted, those ballots represent the voices of eligible North Carolinians and may be decisive in close elections.

North Carolina has a longstanding commitment to both election integrity and voter access. I believe these goals are best achieved by adopting rules that are clear, consistent, and designed to ensure that eligible voters are able to participate without unnecessary procedural obstacles. I respectfully urge the Rules Review Commission to reject these proposed rules or return them for revision.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Respectfully,

Teresa Outlaw
Wake County, North Carolina

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Furika Reed <reed1920@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 4:28 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from reed1920@aol.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the North Carolina State Board of Elections,

Thank you for giving North Carolinians the opportunity to comment on these proposed rules. I know your job is to make sure our elections are secure and fair, and I appreciate the work that goes into that.

After reading the proposals, my biggest concern is that some of the new rules could make it easier for eligible voters to lose their vote because of technical mistakes instead of actual problems with their eligibility.

For the absentee ballot rules, I understand why there needs to be a process for handling ballots with issues. At the same time, I believe the goal should be to help eligible voters fix honest mistakes whenever possible instead of rejecting their ballots. If someone is legally allowed to vote, every reasonable effort should be made to count that vote.

I'm especially thinking about people serving in the military, North Carolinians living overseas, college students away from home, older adults, and people with disabilities. These voters don't always have the ability to respond quickly if there's a problem with their ballot. A delay in the mail or a simple paperwork mistake shouldn't automatically keep their vote from being counted.

I'm also concerned about some of the wording in the proposed rules. Phrases like "irregularity" and "peace and good order" seem open to interpretation. When rules aren't clear, they can end up being applied differently from one county to the next. I don't think where someone lives should affect how election rules are interpreted.

The same concern applies to the proposed voting site rules. Election officials absolutely need the authority to keep polling places safe and organized, but the rules should clearly explain what conduct is actually prohibited. That protects voters, volunteers, and election workers alike and helps everyone know what to expect.

As for the proposed photo ID rules, I hope the Board continues looking for ways to make the process easier to understand. If there's a problem with a voter's identification, they should be notified as quickly as possible and given every opportunity the law allows to correct it.

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Marianne Romanat <marianneromanat@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 2:07 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from marianneromanat@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether the proposed rules re: our elections in NC are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters. I ask you to consider my concerns and the concerns of others about this. before approving them.

I am concerned about mail-in/ absentee ballots being required to be packaged in a particular way. I want our servicemen and women living overseas, and others overseas who are American citizens to be able to vote this way and I'm concerned that servicemen and women and others overseas may not have time to cast a corrected ballot if they make a mistake. This could certainly create confusion for voters.

I'm also very concerned that a provisional ballot would not have to be rejected by a unanimous vote. Requiring a unanimous vote requires that there is a bipartisan concern about the ballot and that would keep our process clear, bipartisan, and making sense. I would want to avoid a simple majority acting in a partisan way, which we have frequently seen in our state of late.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Respectfully,

Rev. Marianne Romanat
Pineville, North Carolina

Marianne Romanat
(c) 828-265-7585

"Now to Him who is able to do immeasurably more than all we ask or imagine, according to His power that is at work within us, to Him be the glory....." Ephesians 3:20-21

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Corine Mack <cmacknaacp@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 1:29 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Voting Rules Concerns

You don't often get email from cmacknaacp@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Hello,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding three recently proposed rules that I believe will lead to confusion and voter disenfranchisement.

The first concern pertains to the NC State Board of Elections rule concerning provisional ballots. Modifying the majority rule introduces an unfair partisan issue that fundamentally compromises the democratic process.

The second proposed regulation significantly infringes upon the rights of our esteemed military personnel.
Should an error occur in the ballot submission process, such as incorrect envelope usage or any other procedural discrepancy, there is no timely mechanism for rectification, thereby potentially disenfranchising these individuals.
We must ensure that our service members retain their right to vote.

Lastly, the proposed applified sound rule.
Music holds significant cultural importance within the Black community. I find this proposed rule to be discriminatory. There have been no substantial complaints regarding sound disruption in previous elections. Consequently, this rule appears to be unnecessary.

Music possesses a universal appeal. It has the capacity to soothe and facilitate relaxation for individuals who may experience extended waiting periods prior to casting their votes.

I pray this letter finds you all well and you are withdrawing or voting against any of these proposed rules.

Thank you,

Rev. Corine Mack
President NAACP Charlotte Mecklenburg Branch
1st V.P. NC NAACP State Conference
Cmacknaacp@gmail.com
Cell:347-683-0264

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kelly Allen <allenatechhs@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 1:01 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Changes to voting rules

You don't often get email from allenatechhs@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

To the NC Rules Review Commission,

I am extremely concerned with the newest change proposals to NC's voting rules.

If someone is out of our state doing important things for the common good, like defending our nation, these rules are going to make it harder for them to have their voice heard. It is absolutely deplorable that our military, as unsupported and under appreciated as they are, will also find voting to be even more difficult. Surely this is something that should be considered before putting this rule into effect.

I am also concerned about the limitations on noise around polling places. We should celebrate our right to vote, and polling places should be fun places to go to. By limiting the volume of sound at these locations, the joy should accompany our right will be dimmed. It is clear that this rule is politically motivated and intended to decrease the likelihood that certain groups vote. Rules should not decrease the representation of any group at these polls.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Kelly Allen
205 Saponi Dr
Hillsborough, NC 27278

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Lyric Kinard <lyric@lyrickinard.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 11:54 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Objection to proposed rule changes

[You don't often get email from lyric@lyrickinard.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I encourage you to reject the new rules changes to how our elections are run.

There is no reason to lower the unanimous agreements standard for rejecting provisional ballots. The change in rules MUST be reasonably necessary and this is not the case in any of the proposed rule changes.

Could the proposal requiring overseas voters to use double envelopes cause confusion? Absolutely yes. There is no reason to add layer on layer of requirements when you know that voter fraud is vanishingly rare.

There is absolutely no reason to lower noise levels in voting lines. You know that people are better able to tolerate long lines and more likely to come out to vote if there is a lively atmosphere that encourages community.

These new rules all ABSOLUTELY make it clear that one side is trying to suppress votes because they know they cannot win without using every method possible to deny votes to people who are legally allowed to vote.

Please do what you know to be the right thing.

Sincerely.
Lyric Kinard
Cary, NC Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Jeff Bost <jtbost@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 10:31 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Unnecessary rules changes

[You don't often get email from jtbost@aol.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

To whom it may concern,

My name is Jeff Bost, a resident of Montgomery county in NC. I'm writing to oppose the 3 preposed rules changes around our polling places. The current rule of unanimous decision regarding the validity of a provisional ballot should stay in place. This is an important safe guard and there's no valid reason to change it. Next, leave absentee ballots alone. The new proposal adds needless complication and definite confusion to this important right to vote. Finally, not allowing music in the voting lines seems petty and somewhat childish. Not sure what's driving this, but changing it doesn't seem warranted.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jeff Bost
175 Pattersons Bridge
New London, NC 28127
Sent from my iPad

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Elizabeth Valsing <elivalsing@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2026 9:11 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Voting restrictions not reasonably necessary and will create confusion

You don't often get email from elivalsing@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I do not support the new rules being considered for NC elections. Specifically, lowering the standard for throwing out ballots to unanimous agreement is not reasonably necessary - we want to err on the side of the voter because this is a democracy. Also, we do not need to create confusion for military or others living out of the state or country by adding requirements to their ballots submission and there is not sufficient justification that it is reasonably necessary to prohibit amplified music at polling places.

Thank you for reading my email.

Eli Valsing 919/967-6587 elivalsing@gmail.com, Carrboro, NC

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Sonia Crandall <divasofie60@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 6:29 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Concerns regrading proposed voting rules

[You don't often get email from divasofie60@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter in Forsyth County. I respectfully ask you to consider whether the proposed voting rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.

1. I am concerned about the proposal that lowers the threshold for county boards to discard provisional ballots submitted with a voter ID exception form from a unanimous vote to a simple majority. What is the justification for this change? I do not believe this proposed rule is reasonably necessary because there are no reported cases of exception forms being wrongfully accepted and no evidence of abuse that would warrant a lower rejection threshold.

2. I am concerned about the proposal that would reclassify certain absentee ballot anomalies as deficiencies requiring voters to take additional action to have their ballots counted.

Numbered Memo 2021-03 already addresses this clearly: if a ballot arrives in a sealed outer envelope, it is not deficient and can be counted without any action from the voter. The memo is explicit, "In all of the above situations, the ballot was received in a sealed envelope and is therefore not deficient."

This proposed rule would override that standard, requiring voters to submit a written attestation before the close of business on the day before county canvass for three common, innocent mistakes. In each case, the ballot arrived intact and the voter's intent is plain. There is no evidence of abuse, no documented failure of the existing guidance, and no security justification for treating these anomalies as deficiencies.

This proposed rule causes confusion and unnecessary barriers for voters who rely on mail-in voting — military voters, homebound voters, elderly voters, voters with disabilities, and voters displaced by natural disasters— for whom meeting a last-minute cure deadline is not always possible.

3. The proposal that prohibits amplified sound at polling places is concerning because activities near polling places, such as music, are an important part of the voting experience of many communities. These activities create a welcoming environment while voters stand in line. Is this proposed rule reasonably necessary? Is there a demonstrated reason for this change?

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.
Respectfully,
Sonia Crandall
Lewisville, NC

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Charla Blumell <charlab78@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 7:35 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from charlab78@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.

I am particularly concerned about the proposal regarding changes to photo ID verification, shorter provisional ballot ID cure deadlines, and stricter processing rules for mail-in and provisional ballots because these proposals impose restrictive administrative hurdles on voters, shorten the window voters have to ensure their lawful ballots are counted, and risk rejecting valid votes based on minor technicalities or partisan voting lines rather than actual fraud.

I do not believe this proposed rule is reasonably necessary because North Carolina's existing voter identification, signature verification, and mail-in security protocols are already robust, secure, and effective at ensuring election integrity without needing additional burdensome requirements that penalize voters.

I am also concerned that this proposal could create confusion or unnecessary barriers by disenfranchising eligible voters who may face work, transportation, or financial constraints that prevent them from meeting compressed deadlines, as well as creating changing, complex standards that confuse both voters and poll workers right before an election.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Respectfully,

Charla

--
Sent from Gmail Mobile

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kelly Davis <kellyjd1089@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 9:15 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Public Comment on Proposed Election Rules

You don't often get email from kellyjd1089@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Members of the Rules Review Commission,

I am a North Carolina voter, and I respectfully ask you to consider whether these proposed rules are reasonably necessary and whether they could create confusion for voters before approving them.

I am particularly concerned about the proposal regarding majority rule to throw out certain mail in ballots because keeping it as unanimous rule prevents partisan interference. If you allow majority rule, either party could throw out ballots for the other candidate.

I do not believe this proposed rule is reasonably necessary because there hasn't been enough evidence to show we are having illegal ballots being cast on a consistent enough basis. I am also afraid by accepting this rule change, it will further weaken the peoples trust that we have a fair and free election.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments before your next meeting.

Respectfully,

Kelly D
Asheboro, North Carolina

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Keets Taylor <keets8385@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 9:58 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Voting rules

[You don't often get email from keets8385@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

I am in favor of continuing the requirement that all three members of the Elections committee must agree unanimously in order to remove a provisional ballot from certification. Changing this rule does not make the election safer.

I am in favor of certifying an absentee ballot even if it was put in the wrong mailing envelope.

Sent from my iPhone