

Rule Citation	Legislative Review Letters Received
08 NCAC 09 .0106	7
08 NCAC 09 .0107	5
08 NCAC 09 .0110	4
08 NCAC 10C .0101	10
08 NCAC 10C .0102	9
08 NCAC 10C .0103	11
08 NCAC 10C .0104	17
08 NCAC 17 .0101	14
08 NCAC 17 .0109	10
08 NCAC 18 .0201	
08 NCAC 18 .0501	
08 NCAC 18 .0502	1
08 NCAC 18 .0503	3
08 NCAC 18 .0504	1
08 NCAC 18 .0505	1

08 NCAC 09 .0106

From: Mark McClure <markmcclure888@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 12:50 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 09.0106 Recount Procedures; General Guidelines

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 .0106 Recount Procedures; General Guidelines** for the following reason:

Lack of authority: The rule fails the lack of authority standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1) because **Rule 08 NCAC 09. 0106** exceeds the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

Rule 08 NCAC 09. 0106 (d) states that a bipartisan team of four officials **shall** be assigned for hand-to-eye recounts, which will be split into two teams. Each team must contain two officials, one from each of the two parties in the State with the largest number of registered voters). The proposed rule violates this mandate for the reasons explained below.

First, the proposed rule removes the current contingency statement, which justifies the reason for assigning additional members to the recount team: *"If, after diligently seeking to fill the positions with voters affiliated with each of the two parties in the State with the largest number of registered voters, the county board still has an insufficient number of officials for the recount",*

In its place, without justification, Rule 08 NCAC 09. 0106 (d) empowers the county board, by a majority vote of its members, to assign to the bipartisan recount team **an unaffiliated voter or voter affiliated with one of the other political parties recognized in the State under G.S. 163-96**. Adding an unaffiliated voter to the recount team violates the bipartisan committee mandate stated above, as does the following provision:

"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”. In other words, the political party that controls the county board can vote to assign two additional voters from their political party to the recount team, which would still meet the requirement to have **at least one official** from each of the two parties with the largest number of registered voters on the team, but give them a 3-1 partisan advantage.

Accordingly, Rule 08 NCAC 09. 0106 exceeds the administrative authority granted by the General Assembly.

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

Sincerely,
Mark McClure
2326 Englewood Avenue
Durham, NC 27705
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: DJ Oronzio <djodemocracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 2:40 PM
To: Ascher, Seth M; rrc.comments; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 09 .0106 Recounts

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 rule 08 NCAC 09 .0106 Recounts (NCSBE Rulemaking Page: <https://www.ncsbe.gov/rules-and-rulemaking>).

Lack of Authority: The rule violates N.C.G.S. [§ 150B-21.9\(a\)\(1\)](#) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.9.html) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

State law (N.C.G.S. [§ 163-182.7](#) - https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_163/GS_163-182.7.html) establishes specific thresholds and procedures for mandatory recounts. Altering these standards, restricting candidate rights to request recounts, or imposing administrative barriers not found in statute exceeds the agency's rulemaking authority.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. [§ 150B-21.3\(b2\)](#) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.3.html), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Oronzio

5300 Arete Way

Raleigh, NC 27607

Wake County



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: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2026 6:09 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — Recounts 08 NCAC 09 .0106

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: Recounts - 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 specifically concerned about the cascading triggering events within a fixed window described within section (f). This rule creates deadlines inside an already short statutory window, and risks making the rule's own machinery, not the statute, the thing that determines whether the canvass happens on time. These redundant administrative procedures add processes that statute doesn't require in order to hit deadlines that the statute does require.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

--

Tiffany Shubert, PhD, PT
919-360-1970

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/shubertconsulting/>

"Imagination is more important than knowledge. For knowledge is limited to all we now know and understand, while imagination embraces the entire world, and all there ever will be to know and understand." - Albert Einstein

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Barbara Lang <bllang16@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2026 2:45 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review of Recounts 08 NCAC 09 .0106, .0107, or .0110

You don't often get email from bllang16@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 rule, Recounts 08 NCAC 09 .0106, 0107, or .0110. 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.

This letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. It's important to our democracy that voting is fair and consistent.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lang
178 Glenpark Place
Cary NC 27511
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robin Barefoot <robinbarefoot@outlook.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2026 10:59 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Robin Barefoot; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - Rule 08 NCAC 09.0106

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 09.0106: General Guidelines (Recount Rules)

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.

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
robinbarefoot@outlook.com
she/her ([Why pronouns matter](#))

08 NCAC 09 .0107

From: Mark McClure <markmcclure888@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:08 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 09.0107 Recount Procedures; First Recount

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 Recount Procedures; First Recount** for the following reason:

Lack of Authority: The rule fails the lack of authority standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1) because **rule 08 NCAC 09. 0107** exceeds the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

Rule 08 NCAC 09 .0107 states: “*The hand count shall be done by a bipartisan team of four in accordance with .0106(d) of this Chapter*”. However, **.0106 (d)** contains provisions that exceed the authority granted by the legislature, therefore, this lack of authority also applies to **Rule 08 NCAC 09. 0107**.

Rule 08 NCAC 09. 0106 (d) states that a bipartisan team of four officials **shall** be assigned for hand-to-eye recounts, which will be split into two teams. Each team must contain two officials, one from each of the two parties in the State with the largest number of registered voters). The proposed rule violates this mandate for the reasons explained below.

First, the proposed rule removes the current contingency statement, which justifies the reason for assigning additional members to the recount team: “*If, after diligently seeking to fill the positions with voters affiliated with each of the two parties in the State with the largest number of registered voters, the county board still has an insufficient number of officials for the recount*”,

In its place, without justification, Rule 08 NCAC 09. 0106 (d) empowers the county board, by a majority vote of its members, to assign to the bipartisan recount team **an unaffiliated voter or voter affiliated with one of the other political parties recognized in the State under G.S. 163-96**. Adding an unaffiliated voter to the

recount team violates the bipartisan committee mandate stated above, as does the following provision:

“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”. In other words, the political party that controls the county board can vote to assign two additional voters from their political party to the recount team, which would still meet the requirement to have **at least one official** from each of the two parties with the largest number of registered voters on the team, but give them a 3-1 partisan advantage. **Accordingly, Rule 08 NCAC 09. 0106 exceeds the administrative authority granted by the General Assembly, and for the same reason, so does Rule 08 NCAC 09 .0107.**

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

Sincerely,
Mark McClure
2326 Englewood Avenue
Durham, NC 27705
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: DJ Oronzio <djodemocracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 3:03 PM
To: Ascher, Seth M; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking; rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 09 .0107 First Recount

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 rule 08 NCAC 09 .0107 First Recount (NCSBE Rulemaking Page: <https://www.ncsbe.gov/rules-and-rulemaking>).

Lack of Necessity: The rule fails the Necessity standard under N.C.G.S. [§ 150B-21.9\(a\)\(3\)](https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter%20150B/GS%20150B-21.9.html) (<https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter 150B/GS 150B-21.9.html>) because it creates redundant administrative procedures that conflict with existing statutory canvass timelines. It is unnecessary and redundant because county boards already have statutory procedures under [Chapter 163](https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/ByChapter/Chapter 163.html) (<https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/ByChapter/Chapter 163.html>) for handling damaged or unreadable ballots during the initial canvass.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. [§ 150B-21.3\(b2\)](https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter 150B/GS 150B-21.3.html) (<https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter 150B/GS 150B-21.3.html>), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Oronzio

5300 Arete Way

Raleigh, NC 27607

Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Barbara Lang <bllang16@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2026 2:45 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review of Recounts 08 NCAC 09 .0106, .0107, or .0110

You don't often get email from bllang16@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 rule, Recounts 08 NCAC 09 .0106, 0107, or .0110. 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.

This letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. It's important to our democracy that voting is fair and consistent.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lang
178 Glenpark Place
Cary NC 27511
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2026 6:49 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — First Recount 08 NCAC 09 .0107

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: First Recount - 08 NCAC 09 .0107

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 especially concerned about the necessity of section c lines 34 - 35 "A county conducting a machine recount shall use only one of the methods in the recount and shall inform the political parties and candidates in writing which method it will use under this Paragraph prior to using that method." Why does the rule require a written notice of the method choice when the statute doesn't require it? This seems like a redundant process that could add time and complexity.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

08 NCAC 09 .0110

Burgos, Alexander N

From: DJ Oronzio <djodemocracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 3:07 PM
To: Ascher, Seth M; rrc.comments; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 09 .0110 Secondary Recounts

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 rule 08 NCAC 09 .0110 Secondary Recounts (NCSBE Rulemaking Page: <https://www.ncsbe.gov/rules-and-rulemaking>).

Lack of Necessity: The rule fails the Necessity standard under N.C.G.S. [§ 150B-21.9\(a\)\(3\)](#) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.9.html) because it creates redundant administrative procedures that conflict with existing statutory canvass timelines. The General Assembly already legislated tight, firm schedules for post-election canvassing and secondary recounts. Changing these timelines by administrative rule creates conflicting schedules that cause unnecessary delays without statutory need.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. [§ 150B-21.3\(b2\)](#) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.3.html), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Oronzio

5300 Arete Way

Raleigh, NC 27607

.

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Barbara Lang <bllang16@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2026 2:45 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review of Recounts 08 NCAC 09 .0106, .0107, or .0110

You don't often get email from bllang16@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 rule, Recounts 08 NCAC 09 .0106, 0107, or .0110. 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.

This letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. It's important to our democracy that voting is fair and consistent.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lang
178 Glenpark Place
Cary NC 27511
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2026 6:53 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — Secondary Recounts
08 NCAC 09 .0110

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: Secondary Recounts - 08 NCAC 09 .0110

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.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

08 NCAC 10C .0101

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kitz Rickert <kitzrickert@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:47 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C 0101 Definitions

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 10C .0101 Definitions.

Lack of Authority: The rule violates N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly. State law (N.C.G.S. § 163-166.4) strictly limits administrative buffer zones to a **maximum 50-foot perimeter** from the entrance of the voting enclosure. Expanding the "site" to cover an entire real estate parcel exceeds the statutory perimeter set by the General Assembly.

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,

Kathleen A. Rickert
2709 Legion Avenue
Durham, North Carolina 27707
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Bob Rodriguez <blrodriguez001@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 3:31 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Ascher, Seth M
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0101 Definitions

Importance: High

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 rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101 Definitions.

My objection is Lack of Authority: The rule violates N.C.G.S. § **150B-21.9(a)(1)** by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

State law (**N.C.G.S. § 163-166.4**) strictly limits administrative buffer zones to a maximum 50-foot perimeter to the door of the entrance of the voting place.

Upon further review, expanding the voting place to cover an entire real estate parcel exceeds the statutory perimeter set by the General Assembly.

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.

I also ask that a reply be sent back to me that you received my email.

Sincerely,
Robert G. Rodriguez
2400 Countrywood Rd
Raleigh, NC 27615
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mark McClure <markmcclure888@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:10 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0101 Definitions

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. I am formally writing to object to the NCSBE's proposed **Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101 Definitions** for the following reasons:

Lack of Authority. Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101 violates N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

State law (N.C.G.S. § 163-166.4) states: *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.*

The definition of "Voting Site" in Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101 states: "*Voting Site*" means **the property on which the voting place is located**. I vote at the main library in Durham, which is situated upon 0.66 acres, which equates to 170 feet x 169.12 feet, which far exceeds the 50 feet statutory perimeter set by the NCGA.

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,

Mark McClure
2326 Englewood Avenue
Durham, NC 27705
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: DJ Oronzio <djodemocracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 3:22 PM
To: rrc.comments; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking; Ascher, Seth M
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0101 Definitions

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 rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101 Definitions (NCSBE Rulemaking Page: <https://www.ncsbe.gov/rules-and-rulemaking>).

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.9.html) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties. Redefining a "voting site" to encompass an entire real estate parcel creates confusion over where standard public property ends and regulated election zones begin, especially on municipal complexes, school campuses, and shared parking lots.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.3(b2) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.3.html), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Oronzio
5300 Arete Way

Raleigh, NC 27607
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: DJ Oronzio <djodemocracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 4:16 PM
To: rrc.comments; Ascher, Seth M; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking; djodemocracy@gmail.com
Subject: [External] Clarification: Written Objections to Retain for Legislative 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.

To the Rules Review Commission:

Following my recent communication regarding retracted submissions, please accept this email specifying the exact list of written objections to RETAIN and process for legislative review under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.3(b2):

1. 08 NCAC 17 .0101 (Verification of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting) 2. 08 NCAC 17 .0109 (Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots) 3. 08 NCAC 10C .0101 (Voting Sites — Definitions) 4. 08 NCAC 10C .0102 (Voting Sites — Buffer Zones) 5. 08 NCAC 10C .0103 (Voting Sites — Electioneering Zones) 6. 08 NCAC 10C .0104 (Voting Sites — Conduct at Voting Sites) 7. 08 NCAC 10B .0103 (Recount Procedures)

I apologize for this mess up. Technology is great when it works properly.

Please ensure that these seven (7) specific objections remain active in the record. I would appreciate an acknowledgement of this request.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Oronzio
5300 Arete Way
Raleigh, NC 27607
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Melissa Holmberg <mholmberg9714@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 2:48 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for legislative review-Voting sights 08 NCAC 10C .0101,.0102,

You don't often get email from mholmberg9714@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 [YOUR COUNTY] County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed rule Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101,.0102,.0103, .0104

The rule violates N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly. The individual county boards of elections should be able to determine the voting sites of its own county based on what counties need to accommodate their voters.

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,
Melissa Holmberg
1000 Sabre Ct, Chapel Hill, NC 27516
Orange County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Al Vos <alvin.vos@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2026 10:21 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review Voting Sites rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101

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 Voting Sites rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

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: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2026 3:03 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101

You don't often get email from tiffany.shubert@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 Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed rule Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101:

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

I am specifically concerned about the lack of clarity in the accepted changes in (4) "area" to "areas" and in (9) "portion of the property" under the possession and control of the county board of elections.

The accepted changes are confusing and will lead to confusion and unequal application across counties as to what exactly is considered the portion of the property under the possession and control of the county board of elections. This will lead to confusion about the boundaries for campaigning around election sites and will be problematic for all involved.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Barbara Lang <bllang16@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2026 2:38 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review- Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101 .0102, .0103 or .0104

You don't often get email from bllang16@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 rule, Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101 .0102, .0103 or .0104. 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

This letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. It's important to our democracy that voting is fair and consistent.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lang
178 Glenpark Place
Cary NC 27511
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robin Barefoot <robinbarefoot@outlook.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2026 10:59 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Robin Barefoot; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - Rule 08 NCAC 10C.0101: Definitions (Voting Site Rules)

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 10C.0101: Definitions (Voting Site Rules).

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
robinbarefoot@outlook.com
she/her [Why pronouns matter](#)

08 NCAC 10C .0102

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Rosemary McGee <rosemary.mcgee47@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:23 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 10C .0102

You don't often get email from rosemary.mcgee47@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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 10C .0102 - Voting Site Buffer Zone** for the following reasons:

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. § 150-21.3(b2)** because it is ambiguous, inconsistent and does not include the space allocated to the buffer zone as part of the rule, whereas the measurements for curbside voting is explicitly stated in the rule.

The rule provides unlimited authority to the Chief Judge to modify the buffer zone beyond what's expected since the voting site has already been reviewed and approved.

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

Respectfully,

Rosemary McGee
536 Middleton Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robert McGee <rjmcgee2011@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:43 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 10C .0102

You don't often get email from rjmcgee2011@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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 10C .0102 - Voting Site Buffer Zone** for the following reasons:

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. § 150-21.3(b2)** because it is ambiguous, inconsistent and does not include the space allocated to the buffer zone as part of the rule, whereas the measurements for curbside voting is explicitly stated in the rule.

The rule provides unlimited authority to the Chief Judge to modify the buffer zone beyond what's expected since the voting site has already been reviewed and approved.

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

Respectfully,

Robert McGee
536 Middleton Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Bob Rodriguez <blrodriguez001@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 3:37 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Ascher, Seth M
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0102 Voting Site Buffer Zones

Importance: High

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 rule 08 NCAC 10C .0102 Voting Site Buffer Zones.

My Objection is Lack of Authority: The rule violates N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

This rule imposes restrictions on public property outside the statutory 50-foot limit without explicit authority from the General Assembly.

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.

I also ask that a reply be sent back to me that you received my email.

Sincerely,
Robert G. Rodriguez
2400 Countrywood Rd
Raleigh, NC 27615
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mark McClure <celebratingphotography2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:21 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0102 Voting Site Buffer Zones

You don't often get email from celebratingphotography2@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 Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed **Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0102 Voting Site Buffer Zones** for the following reason:

Lack of Clarity: The rule violates N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because the definition of "voting site" does not correlate with the following strict definition specified in N.C.G.S. § 163-166.4):

*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.***

The definition of "Voting Site" in Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0101 states: "*Voting Site*" means **the property on which the voting place is located.** I vote at the main library in Durham, which is situated upon 0.66 acres, which equates to 170 feet x 169.12 feet, which far exceeds the 50 feet statutory perimeter set by the NCGA.

This lack of clarity and ambiguous definition of "voting site", also applies to the proposed rule **08 NCAC 10C 01.002.**

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,
Mark McClure
2326 Englewood Avenue
Durham, NC 27705
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: DJ Oronzio <djodemocracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 3:25 PM
To: rrc.comments; Ascher, Seth M; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0102 Buffer Zones

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 rule 08 NCAC 10C .0102 Buffer Zones (NCSBE Rulemaking Page: <https://www.ncsbe.gov/rules-and-rulemaking>).

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.9.html) because it fails to establish uniform measurement protocols for laying out curbside voting and buffer zones. This lack of objective standards leads to arbitrary and non-uniform enforcement across different county boards of elections.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.3(b2) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.3.html), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Oronzio

5300 Arete Way

Raleigh, NC 27607

Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Barbara Lang <bllang16@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2026 2:38 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review- Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101 .0102, .0103 or .0104

You don't often get email from bllang16@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 rule, Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101 .0102, .0103 or .0104. 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

This letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. It's important to our democracy that voting is fair and consistent.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lang
178 Glenpark Place
Cary NC 27511
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2026 3:15 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0102

You don't often get email from tiffany.shubert@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 Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed rule Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0102.

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

I am specifically concerned about the lack of clarity in the accepted change in language from "establish" to "designate". The prior language was clear that the board had to adopt a resolution, which is a specific, formal administrative act that is voted on by the board. Adopting a resolution has very clear steps one must take and ensures that all county boards of elections perform this task in a standardized way.

Designate typically does not require a formal resolution, and therein lies the lack of clarity. By using the term "designate" some counties may have one person make a decision as to where the buffer zone is, other counties may make a memo or a map. There will be no consistency in implementation or documentation.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

08 NCAC 10C .0103

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Rosemary McGee <rosemary.mcgee47@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:45 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 10C .0103

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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 10C .0103 - Voting Site Electioneering Zone** for the following reasons:

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. § 150-21.3(b2)** because it is ambiguous, lacking the proper definition of the size of the electioneering zone and whether the judge has the authority to physically reassign the placement of the zone.

The rule specifies that the electioneering zone should be physically adjacent to the buffer zone; however its actual size or limit is not included as part of the rule. It appears the judge's authority has no bounds and the size and location can be changed based on random/arbitrary conditions.

The rule needs to clearly define:

-
-
- What constitutes a voting site is not defined? Is it the voting place, plus the buffer zone plus the electioneering zone or beyond?
-
-
- Does the judge's authority extend beyond the electioneering zone?
-

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

Respectfully,

Robert McGee
536 Middleton Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Rosemary McGee <rosemary.mcgee47@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:26 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 10C .0103

You don't often get email from rosemary.mcgee47@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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 10C .0103 - Voting Site Electioneering Zone** for the following reasons:

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. § 150-21.3(b2)** because it is ambiguous, lacking the proper definition of the size of the electioneering zone and whether the judge has the authority to physically reassign the placement of the zone.

The rule specifies that the electioneering zone should be physically adjacent to the buffer zone; however its actual size or limit is not included as part of the rule. It appears the judge's authority has no bounds and the size and location can be changed based on random/arbitrary conditions.

The rule needs to clearly define:

-
-
- What constitutes a voting site is not defined? Is it the voting place, plus the buffer zone plus the electioneering zone or beyond?
-
-
- Does the judge's authority extend beyond the electioneering zone?
-

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

Respectfully,

Rosemary McGee
536 Middleton Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robert McGee <rjmcgee2011@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:57 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 10C .0103

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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 10C .0103 - Voting Site Electioneering Zone** for the following reasons:

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. § 150-21.3(b2)** because it is ambiguous, lacking the proper definition of the size of the electioneering zone and whether the judge has the authority to physically reassign the placement of the zone.

The rule specifies that the electioneering zone should be physically adjacent to the buffer zone; however its actual size or limit is not included as part of the rule. It appears the judge's authority has no bounds and the size and location can be changed based on random/arbitrary conditions.

The rule needs to clearly define:

-
-
- What constitutes a voting site is not defined? Is it the voting place, plus the buffer zone plus the electioneering zone or beyond?
-
-
- Does the judge's authority extend beyond the electioneering zone?
-

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

Respectfully,

Robert McGee
536 Middleton Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Bob Rodriguez <blrodriguez001@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 3:40 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Ascher, Seth M
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0103 Voting Site Electioneering Zone

Importance: High

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 rule 08 NCAC 10C .0103 Voting Site Electioneering Zone.

My Objection is the Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2). Proposed Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0103 fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties and, interpretation of what "adequate" electioneering space can mean.

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.

I also ask that a reply be sent back to me that you received my email.

Sincerely,
Robert G. Rodriguez
2400 Countrywood Rd
Raleigh, NC 27615
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mark McClure <markmcclure888@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:52 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0103 Voting Site Electioneering Zone

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 10C .0103 Voting Site Electioneering Zone** for the following reason:

Lack of authority: The rule fails the lack of authority standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1) because NCGS § 163-166.4 (b) states “the county board 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 proposed **rule 08 NCAC 10C .0103** exceeds the authority granted by the NCGA because the new rule would allow county boards to decide whether to establish alternative electioneering zones that are not adjacent to the buffer zone.

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,

Mark McClure
2326 Englewood Avenue
Durham, NC 27705
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Melissa Holmberg <mholmberg9714@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 2:48 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for legislative review-Voting sights 08 NCAC 10C .0101,.0102,

You don't often get email from mholmberg9714@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 [YOUR COUNTY] County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed rule Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101,.0102,.0103, .0104

The rule violates N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly. The individual county boards of elections should be able to determine the voting sites of its own county based on what counties need to accommodate their voters.

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,
Melissa Holmberg
1000 Sabre Ct, Chapel Hill, NC 27516
Orange County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Barbara Lang <bllang16@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2026 2:38 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review- Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101 .0102, .0103 or .0104

You don't often get email from bllang16@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 rule, Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101 .0102, .0103 or .0104. 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

This letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. It's important to our democracy that voting is fair and consistent.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lang
178 Glenpark Place
Cary NC 27511
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: DJ Oronzio <djodemocracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 3:27 PM
To: rrc.comments; Ascher, Seth M; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0103 Electioneering Zones

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 rule 08 NCAC 10C .0103 Electioneering Zones (NCSBE Rulemaking Page: <https://www.ncsbe.gov/rules-and-rulemaking>).

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) (<https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter 150B/GS 150B-21.9.html>) because it fails to define objective standards for what constitutes "adequate" electioneering space. This vagueness provides county boards of elections unbridled discretion to designate remote or obscured areas, resulting in inconsistent and arbitrary application across different counties.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.3(b2) (<https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter 150B/GS 150B-21.3.html>), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Oronzio

5300 Arete Way

Raleigh, NC 27607

Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: DJ Oronzio <djodemocracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 4:16 PM
To: rrc.comments; Ascher, Seth M; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking; djodemocracy@gmail.com
Subject: [External] Clarification: Written Objections to Retain for Legislative 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.

To the Rules Review Commission:

Following my recent communication regarding retracted submissions, please accept this email specifying the exact list of written objections to RETAIN and process for legislative review under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.3(b2):

1. 08 NCAC 17 .0101 (Verification of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting) 2. 08 NCAC 17 .0109 (Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots) 3. 08 NCAC 10C .0101 (Voting Sites — Definitions) 4. 08 NCAC 10C .0102 (Voting Sites — Buffer Zones) 5. 08 NCAC 10C .0103 (Voting Sites — Electioneering Zones) 6. 08 NCAC 10C .0104 (Voting Sites — Conduct at Voting Sites) 7. 08 NCAC 10B .0103 (Recount Procedures)

I apologize for this mess up. Technology is great when it works properly.

Please ensure that these seven (7) specific objections remain active in the record. I would appreciate an acknowledgement of this request.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Oronzio
5300 Arete Way
Raleigh, NC 27607
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2026 3:24 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0103

You don't often get email from tiffany.shubert@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 Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed rule Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0103.

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

I am specifically concerned about the lack of clarity in the accepted change in language from "adopting a resolution" to "designate". The prior language was clear that the board of election had to adopt a resolution, which is a specific, formal administrative act that is voted on by the board. Adopting a resolution has very clear steps one must take and ensures that all county boards of elections perform this task in a standardized way.

Designate typically does not require a formal resolution, and therein lies the lack of clarity. By using the term "designate" some counties may have one person make a decision as to where the electioneering zone is, other counties may make a memo or a map. There will be no consistency in implementation or documentation, and thus there may be unequal application across counties.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

08 NCAC 10C .0104

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Rosemary McGee <rosemary.mcgee47@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:48 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 10C .0104

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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 10C .0104 - Conduct at Voting Sites** for the following reasons:

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. § 150-21.3(b2)** because the rule is unclear regarding what constitutes a 'voting site', where the judges authority begins and more importantly ends, and where sound amplification devices can be used. This can actually threaten to unconstitutionally limit protected expression which is a violation of the First Amendment.

The rule needs to be clear about what applies to the voting place versus within the electioneering zone and importantly beyond the engineering zone.

Clearly defining and justifying the boundaries and authority of the judge is needed otherwise some of the most effective voter mobilization actions in N.C. can be suppressed.

It's arbitrary as to what defines an acceptable noise. It's unclear if the Chief Judges authority extends beyond the electioneering zone, and how protected speech is being honored. While voters should be protected from serious disruption, voting does not promise a quiet zone.

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

Respectfully,

Robert McGee
536 Middleton Place

Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Rosemary McGee <rosemary.mcgee47@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:30 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 10C .0104

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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 10C .0104 - Conduct at Voting Sites** for the following reasons:

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. § 150-21.3(b2)** because the rule is unclear regarding what constitutes a 'voting site', where the judges authority begins and more importantly ends, and where sound amplification devices can be used. This can actually threaten to unconstitutionally limit protected expression which is a violation of the First Amendment.

The rule needs to be clear about what applies to the voting place versus within the electioneering zone and importantly beyond the engineering zone.

Clearly defining and justifying the boundaries and authority of the judge is needed otherwise some of the most effective voter mobilization actions in N.C. can be suppressed.

It's arbitrary as to what defines an acceptable noise. It's unclear if the Chief Judges authority extends beyond the electioneering zone, and how protected speech is being honored. While voters should be protected from serious disruption, voting does not promise a quiet zone.

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

Respectfully,

Rosemary McGee
536 Middleton Place

Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robert McGee <rjmcgee2011@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:54 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 10C .0104

You don't often get email from rjmcgee2011@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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 10C .0104 - Conduct at Voting Sites** for the following reasons:

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. § 150-21.3(b2)** because the rule is unclear regarding what constitutes a 'voting site', where the judges authority begins and more importantly ends, and where sound amplification devices can be used. This can actually threaten to unconstitutionally limit protected expression which is a violation of the First Amendment.

The rule needs to be clear about what applies to the voting place versus within the electioneering zone and importantly beyond the engineering zone.

Clearly defining and justifying the boundaries and authority of the judge is needed otherwise some of the most effective voter mobilization actions in N.C. can be suppressed.

It's arbitrary as to what defines an acceptable noise. It's unclear if the Chief Judges authority extends beyond the electioneering zone, and how protected speech is being honored. While voters should be protected from serious disruption, voting does not promise a quiet zone.

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

Respectfully,

Robert McGee

536 Middleton Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Bob Rodriguez <blrodriguez001@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 3:45 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Ascher, Seth M
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0104 Conduct at Voting Sites

Importance: High

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 rule 08 NCAC 10C .0104 Conduct at Voting Sites.

My Objection is Lack of Clarity: Under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) the proposed rule 08 NCAC 10C .0104 fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

The proposed rule uses vague and subjective terms like "that the noise is disrupting the orderly conduct of voting and the ability for persons to communicate when they are within the voting enclosure".

There is a need to define decibel levels, duration, and distance limits. Chief judges are left to decide arbitrarily what is "too loud" without guidance.

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.

I also ask that a reply be sent back to me that you received my email.

Sincerely,
Robert G. Rodriguez
2400 Countrywood Rd
Raleigh, NC 27615
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mark Swallow <mswal2846@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 8:00 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C.0104 - Conduct at Voting Sites
Attachments: mswal2846.vcf

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 rule 08 NCAC 10C.0104 - Conduct at Voting Sites.

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.

Under Section c item 2 this is way overkill. Chief Judges already have the ability to work this with whomever is causing "issues" at the polling location. This rule of "No person ... shall use a sound amplification device..." is ridiculous and, that statement alone, could be used to limit free speech even if not disrupting anything or anyone at the polls. This is clearly a target to impact "Souls to the Polls" events. This is blatant manipulation of rules to prevent voting.

Do not approve this rule!

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.3(b2), this letter serves as my formal

written objection and I clearly request that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

--

Regards,

Mark E Swallow
email: mswal2846@gmail.com
cell: 919-931-2662
fax: 919-573-9463

08/18/2026

N.C. Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

Re: 08 NCAC 10C .0104

Members of the Commission:

I request that the above rule (08 NCAC 10C .0104) be reviewed in the upcoming legislative session as set out in N.C.G.S. 150B-21.3. I further request that the rule be subject to a delayed effective date as set out in that same provision.

As the Advocacy & Civic Engagement Manager at Casa Azul de Wilson, I work with young people and families to build civic knowledge and confidence. Through our work, we have seen how intimidating the voting process can be, especially for young and first-time voters.

Community-based efforts such as **Party to the Polls** help make voting feel welcoming and accessible. At Casa Azul, we have been able to be a friendly and familiar face for our community at the polls, helping voters feel more comfortable participating in the process. These efforts are nonpartisan and are focused on encouraging civic participation, not influencing how anyone votes.

I am concerned that this rule could unnecessarily limit peaceful, community-centered efforts that help people—particularly first-time voters—feel welcomed and supported at the polls. I respectfully ask the Commission to consider the impact of this rule on organizations working to increase civic participation and to allow additional time for review and community input.

Thank you for your consideration,

Andressia Ramirez

Andressia Ramirez
Advocacy & Civic Engagement Manager
4512 Tammy Lane
Wilson, North Carolina

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Chiquitta W. Lesene <cwlesene@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 4:21 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] ATTENTION RRC: Objecting 08 NCAC 10C .0104

You don't often get email from cwlesene@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.

N.C. Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

Re: [08 NCAC 10C .0104]

Members of the Commission:

I request that the above rule (08 NCAC 10C .0104) be reviewed in the upcoming legislative session as set out in N.C.G.S. 150B-21.3. I further request that the rule be subject to a delayed effective date as set out in that same provision.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chiquitta W. Lesene
705 Kiwi Stone Circle
Jacksonville, NC 28546

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Fran Smith <swafran@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 4:15 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Requesting Legislative Review of Rule [08 NCAC 10C .0104]

You don't often get email from swafran@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 18, 2026

N.C. Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

Re: [08 NCAC 10C .0104]

Members of the Commission:

I request that the above rule (08 NCAC 10C .0104) be reviewed in the upcoming legislative session as set out in N.C.G.S. 150B-21.3. I further request that the rule be subject to a delayed effective date as set out in that same provision.

One-stop Early Voting is not only a time to cast a ballot, but also an important opportunity to encourage participation and build community around the democratic process. For years, we have used music and “Party at the Polls” activities outside voting sites to create a welcoming, positive atmosphere and encourage people to exercise their right to vote. These activities are conducted without interfering with voting.

Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0104 would severely limit these efforts and give voting site officials overly broad discretion to restrict lawful activity based simply on whether sound can be heard inside the voting enclosure. This could lead to inconsistent enforcement and the unnecessary removal of volunteers and community members who are peacefully encouraging voter participation. The rule would especially hinder outreach in Black communities and other communities where organized poll presence programs help voters feel welcomed, informed, and supported. I respectfully request that the Commission delay the rule and require clearer, more narrowly tailored standards that protect the voting process without silencing lawful community engagement. Thank you for your consideration.

Francine Smith

500 Orange Street
Goldsboro, NC 27530

"...but those who hope in the LORD will renew their strength. They will soar on wings like eagles; they will run and not grow weary, they will walk and not be faint. Is 40:31

FORWARD TOGETHER, Not One Step Back

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Hausson Byrd <hausson@blueprintnc.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 4:14 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] ATTENTION RRC: Objecting 08 NCAC 10C .0104

You don't often get email from hausson@blueprintnc.org. [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 18th, 2026

N.C. Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

Re: [08 NCAC 10C .0104]

Members of the Commission:

I request that the above rule (08 NCAC 10C .0104) be reviewed in the upcoming legislative session as set out in N.C.G.S. 150B-21.3. I further request that the rule be subject to a delayed effective date as set out in that same provision.

Thank you for your consideration.

Hausson Byrd

1000 Aaron Drive ,
Raleigh NC, 27610

--



HAUSSON BYRD | *he/him*

Eastern NC Associate | Blueprint North Carolina

PO Box 607, Durham, NC 27702

hausson@blueprintnc.org

919-714-3871

www.blueprintnc.org

Blueprint North Carolina (BPNC) is a public charity that only engages in activities that are permissible under Internal Revenue Code section 501(c)(3). BPNC and the members of the coalition are strictly prohibited from participating or intervening in any political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to any candidate for public office. All BPNC activities will be strictly non-partisan. In addition, BPNC activities will not be coordinated with any candidate, political party or other partisan entity.

Blueprint NC is a public charity that only engages in activities that are permissible under Internal Revenue Code section 501(c)(3). Blueprint NC and the members of the coalition are strictly prohibited from participating or intervening in any political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to any candidate for public office. All Blueprint activities will be strictly non-partisan. In addition, Blueprint activities will not be coordinated with any candidate, political party or other partisan entity.

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Courtney Patterson <patterson052@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 4:14 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Objecting 08 NCAC 10C .0104.

You don't often get email from patterson052@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 18, 2026

N.C. Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

Re: [08 NCAC 10C .0104]

Members of the Commission:

I request that the above rule (08 NCAC 10C .0104] be reviewed in the upcoming legislative session as set out in N.C.G.S. 150B-21.3. I further request that the rule be subject to a delayed effective date as set out in that same provision.

These sites have been a space that have made polling places much more friendly for voters and have served as a place that voters have their questions answered. This has
Thank you for your consideration.

--

Courtney Patterson
1105 Patterson Rd, Kinston, NC 28504
patterson052@gmail.com
252-361-0585

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Rosa Adams <rcb0206@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 4:07 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] ATTENTION RRC: Objecting 08 NCAC 10C .0104

You don't often get email from rcb0206@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 18, 2026

N.C. Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

Re: [08 NCAC 10C .0104]

Members of the Commission:

I request that the above rule (08 NCAC 10C .0104) be reviewed in the upcoming legislative session as set out in N.C.G.S. 150B-21.3. I further request that the rule be subject to a delayed effective date as set out in that same provision.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rosa Adams
108 Hannah Dr, Elizabeth City, NC 27909

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Goldsboro Wayne NAACP <info@goldsborowaynenaacp.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 6:08 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] REVIEW OF RULE [08 NCAC 10C .0104]

You don't often get email from info@goldsborowaynenaacp.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.

N.C. Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

REGARDING RULE [08 NCAC 10C .0104]

On behalf of the Goldsboro Wayne Branch of the NAACP, we are requesting that the above rule (08 NCAC 10C .0104) be reviewed in the upcoming legislative session as set out in N.C.G.S. 150B-21.3. We further request that the rule be subject to a delayed effective date as set out in that same provision. This ruling will have an adverse effect on our community. Early voting is more than just casting a ballot; it is a chance to encourage participation, support voters, and strengthen community engagement in the democratic process.

For years, the Goldsboro Wayne NAACP has been present at early voting sites to help voters feel informed, welcomed, and safe. Our volunteers assist with voter education, answer questions, and encourage turnout while also helping to ensure a peaceful and accessible voting environment. Community outreach, including music and “Party at the Polls” activities, has been used to create a positive atmosphere without interfering with voting.

Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0104 would place broad limits on these efforts by allowing restrictions on activities simply because sound may be heard inside the voting enclosure. This could lead to uneven enforcement and, at the whim of precinct officials, the removal of volunteers who are peacefully supporting voters.

The Goldsboro Wayne NAACP respectfully urges the Commission to delay implementation of this rule and adopt clearer, narrower standards that protect orderly voting while still allowing lawful voter outreach and community engagement.

Thank you for your consideration.

Goldsboro Wayne Branch NAACP
John Barnes President

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mark McClure <celebratingphotography2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:17 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0104 Conduct at Voting Sites

You don't often get email from celebratingphotography2@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 Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed **Rule 08 NCAC 10C .0104 Conduct at Voting Sites** for the following reason:

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2)** because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to disparate application across the state. It uses vague, subjective terms like "disruptive noise" or "unreasonable disruption" without defining decibel levels or distance limits. Chief judges are left to decide arbitrarily what is "too loud." Similarly, defining a "sound amplification device" as "any vehicle's internal audio system that is audible beyond the interior of the vehicle" [with the windows up; down?] is also open to interpretation.

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,

Mark McClure
2326 Englewood Avenue
Durham, NC
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: DJ Oronzio <djodemocracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 3:30 PM
To: rrc.comments; Ascher, Seth M; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 10C .0104 Conduct at Voting Sites

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 rule 08 NCAC 10C .0104 Conduct at Voting Sites (NCSBE Rulemaking Page: <https://www.ncsbe.gov/rules-and-rulemaking>).

Lack of Clarity: The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.9.html) because it uses subjective, undefined terms like "disruptive noise" and "unreasonable disruption" without providing objective standards, decibel limits, or distance thresholds. This leaves enforcement entirely to the subjective discretion of individual chief judges, guaranteeing arbitrary and non-uniform enforcement across polling sites.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.3(b2) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.3.html), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Oronzio

5300 Arete Way

Raleigh, NC 27607

Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Barbara Lang <bllang16@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2026 2:38 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review- Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101 .0102, .0103 or .0104

You don't often get email from bllang16@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 rule, Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0101 .0102, .0103 or .0104. 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

This letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. It's important to our democracy that voting is fair and consistent.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lang
178 Glenpark Place
Cary NC 27511
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2026 3:35 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0104

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 Voting Sites 08 NCAC 10C .0104.

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

I am specifically concerned about the lack of clarity created by removing the prior language that clearly stated the explicit locations where this rule applied to a more general "voting site" which can easily be interpreted in different ways by different individuals. I am also concerned about the definition of audible. The rule states sound or vibration that can be detected by a person. Does this include the sound of someone using oxygen or some other assistive device that makes an audible sound when being used?

This lack of clarity is concerning and can easily result in a situation where different county BOE apply the rules differently.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

08 NCAC 17 .0101

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robert McGee <rjmcgee2011@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:36 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 17.0101

You don't often get email from rjmcgee2011@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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 17.0101 - Verification of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting** for the following reason:

Lack of Clarity: The rule violates the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. 150B-21.9(a)(2)** because it's unclear, overly complex and opens the door to partisan influence.

The rule restricts the voter, creating an unnecessary increase in process, complexity and cost as government issued/approved photo IDs are less likely to be held by lower-income, minority, elderly, and student voters.

If the voter's ID is challenged, the voter is required to navigate an exception affidavit process, adding time, costs and travel burdens. Acceptance of the affidavit is based on a majority vs unanimous vote which now opens the door for partisan boards to reject the provisional ballot.

The current rule discards a commitment to enable the voter to vote. Discarding a legitimate ballot demands *genuine* bipartisan consensus. The objective of the current rule does not focus on increasing or even maintaining overall voter participation.

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

Respectfully,

Robert McGee
536 Middleton Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Rosemary McGee <rosemary.mcgee47@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:17 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 17.0101

You don't often get email from rosemary.mcgee47@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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 17.0101 - Verification of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting** for the following reason:

Lack of Clarity: The rule violates the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. 150B-21.9(a)(2)** because it's unclear, overly complex and opens the door to partisan influence.

The rule restricts the voter, creating an unnecessary increase in process, complexity and cost as government issued/approved photo IDs are less likely to be held by lower-income, minority, elderly, and student voters.

If the voter's ID is challenged, the voter is required to navigate an exception affidavit process, adding time, costs and travel burdens. Acceptance of the affidavit is based on a majority vs unanimous vote which now opens the door for partisan boards to reject the provisional ballot.

A unanimous vote carries unique significance, symbolizing solidarity, cooperation and agreement when considering different opinions, and insulates against partisan interference.

The current rule discards a commitment to enable the voter to vote. Discarding a legitimate ballot demands *genuine* bipartisan consensus. The objective of the current rule does not focus on increasing or even maintaining overall voter participation.

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

Respectfully,

Rosemary McGee
536 Middleton Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kitz Rickert <kitzrickert@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 6:42 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Fwd: Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review -Photo ID - NCAC 17 .0101

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.

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kitz Rickert <kitzrickert@hotmail.com>
Date: August 20, 2026 at 5:06:19 PM EDT
To: rcc.comments@oah.nc.gov
Cc: rules@ncsbe.gov
Subject: **Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review -Photo ID - NCAC 17 .0101**

I am a registered voter in Durham County, writing to formally object to NCSBE's proposed rule for Photo ID 08 NCAC 17 .0101. The rule fails the Necessity standard under N.C.G.S and 150B-21.9 (a) (3) because it creates redundant administrative procedures that conflict with existing statutory canvass timelines.

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

Sincerely,

Kathleen Rickert
2709 Legion Avenue
Durham, North Carolina 27707
Durham County

Kitz Rickert
cell 773-329-0847

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Bob Rodriguez <blrodriguez001@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 3:15 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Ascher, Seth M
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review -- 08 NCAC 17 .0101 Verification of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting

You don't often get email from blrodriguez001@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 rule 08 NCAC 17 .0101 Verification of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting.

My Objection is **Lack of Authority**: The rule violates **N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1)** by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

State statute (**N.C.G.S. § 163-166.16**) strictly requires ID exceptions to be construed liberally in favor of the voter.

By giving a partisan majority (3 Republicans – 2 Democrats) on a county board the power to discard a voter's signed affidavit without a high standard exceeds the administrative authority granted by the legislature.

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.

I also ask that a reply be sent back to me that you received my email.

Sincerely,
Robert G. Rodriguez
2400 Countrywood Rd
Raleigh, NC 27615
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 8:52 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — Verification Of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting 08 NCAC 17.0101

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: Verification Of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting 08 NCAC 17.0101

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.

The rule previously included e (1) which allows for provisional ballot with an affidavit claiming an exemption to the identification requirement, which is an efficient and effective way to remedy the situation, especially if a voter does not have their ID due to a natural disaster such as Hurricane Helene or Tropical Storm Chantal, both of which destroyed people's homes and belongings.

The updated rule requires the individual to not only return to the BOE with their ID, but to do it before the county canvass, putting unrealistic time constraints on the voter and administrative burden on the county board staff member, when a signed affidavit should suffice. I have seen how hard the BOE staff work and how busy the offices are during this time. I am concerned the rule as written is redundant and will put a significant administrative burden on board of election staff members during an already busy time.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mark McClure <celebratingphotography2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:19 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — Rule 08 NCAC 17.0101 – Verification of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting

You don't often get email from celebratingphotography2@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 Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed **Rule 08 NCAC 17.0101, Verification of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting** for the following reason.

Lack of Authority: The rule violates N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9 (a)(1) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly. State statute (N.C.G.S. § 163-166.16) strictly requires ID exceptions to be construed liberally in favor of the voter. Giving a simple partisan majority (3-2) on a county board the power to discard a voter's signed affidavit without a high standard exceeds the administrative authority given by the legislature.

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,

Mark McClure

2326 Englewood Avenue

Durham, NC 27705

Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Melissa Holmberg <mholmberg9714@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 2:32 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for legislative Review Photo ID NCAC 17 .0101

You don't often get email from mholmberg9714@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 Orange County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed rule Photo ID 08 NCAC .0101 or.0109

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties. This will cause confusion and will lead to legitimate votes not being counted infringing on our constitutional right to free and fair elections.

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,
Melissa Holmberg
1000 Sabre CT.
Chapel Hill , NC 27516
Orange County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Al Vos <alvin.vos@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2026 10:11 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review Photo ID — 08 NCAC 17.0101

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 rule on Photo ID — 08 NCAC 17.0101.

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

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

--

Al Vos
alvin.vos@gmail.com
571-395-5229 (mobile)

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Barbara Lang <bllang16@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2026 2:41 PM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review of Photo ID 08 NCAC 17 .0101 or .0108

You don't often get email from bllang16@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 rule, Photo ID 08 NCAC 17 .0101 or .0108. The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties. This letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. It's important to our democracy that voting is fair and consistent.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lang
178 Glenpark Place
Cary NC 27511
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robin Barefoot <robinbarefoot@outlook.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2026 10:59 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Robin Barefoot; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - Rule 08 NCAC 17.0101

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 17.0101: Verification of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting

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
robinbarefoot@outlook.com
she/her ([Why pronouns matter](#))

Burgos, Alexander N

From: TreKeny@outlook.com
Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2026 1:01 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: seth.ascher@oahnc.gov; Wiggs, Travis C; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking; Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Formal Request for Legislative Review 08 NCAC 17 .00101(a)(e)(1) and (a)(e)(2)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from trekeny@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.

Trey Kennedy
6539 Clarksdale Ln
Durham, NC 27713
August 15th , 2026

N.C. Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

Dear Commissioners:

Chair Representative Parker and

Members: Senators Doran, Dixon, Hahn, Hyde and Nelson
Representatives Loutit, Overton, Powell, and
Rules Coordinators Seth Ascher/ Travis Wiggs and
Steele

Adam

Re: 08 NCAC 17 .00101(a)(e)(1) and (a)(e)(2) Verification Of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting

In the first cited section of the rule above, **(a)(e)(1)** it states (per PDF p5, line 1-5): "If the voter brings photo identification that is an acceptable type...unless the county board unanimously decides the the photo identification presented does not satisfy Subparagraphs (a)(2) and (a)(3) of thie Rule, in which case...grounds for its decision."

Whereas in cited section of the rule above, **(a)(e)(2)** it states (per PDF p5 line 10): "To vote by provisional ballot with an affidavit claiming exception to the identification requirement...the county board shall count the provisional ballot unless the county board finds by majority vote that the affidavit is false."

OBJECTION

1. LACK OF CLARITY --- Under NC GS 150B-21.9 this rule fails the clear and unambiguous test. It is unclear why a decision needed for a photo ID - something that can be visually seen by all County Board members - and an affidavit - also something that can be visually seen by all County Board members - would require unequal evaluation. Further, why wouldn't the more serious of the offenses - a false affidavit - be the one that SHOULD require a unanimous decision. It seems to need some clarification to explain why the lesser situation of the Photo ID, seems more significant to need a unanimous ruling than

the affidavit which could be criminal. Clearly these two situations should be AT LEAST equal. The affidavit should be expected to be able to use more input and examination than the photo ID, but the Photo ID can be subject to Partisanship without being unanimous as well. It's my suggestion that both issues be unanimous, but AT minimum, the affidavit.

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.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Keny Kennedy", with a horizontal line drawn underneath the signature.

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 11:57 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — Photo ID 08 NCAC 17 .0101

You don't often get email from tiffany.shubert@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 Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed rule Photo ID - 08 NCAC 17 .0101

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

I am referring specifically to section (e) (2) lines 9 - 11: "the county board shall count the provisional ballot unless the county board finds by majority vote that the affidavit is false. The county board shall substantiate any finding of falsity with grounds recorded in a written decision, and those grounds shall be based only on facts and not speculation."

There are no objective standards listed for the county BOEs to use to determine if an affidavit is false. Determining that an individual generated a false affidavit is a significant decision, one that should have clear standards that need to be uniformly applied across all county Board of Elections. Without this level of clarity this rule can easily be applied unequally across counties.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: DJ Oronzio <djodemocracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 2:23 PM
To: rrc.comments; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking; Ascher, Seth M
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 17 .0101 Verification of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting

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 rule 08 NCAC 17 .0101 Verification of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting (NCSBE Rulemaking Page: <https://www.ncsbe.gov/rules-and-rulemaking>).

Lack of Authority: The rule violates N.C.G.S. [§ 150B-21.9\(a\)\(1\)](#) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.9.html) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly. State statute (N.C.G.S. [§ 163-166.16](#) - https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_163/GS_163-166.16.html) strictly requires ID exceptions to be construed liberally in favor of the voter. Giving a simple partisan majority (3-2) on a county board the power to discard a voter's signed affidavit without a high standard exceeds the administrative authority granted by the legislature.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. [§ 150B-21.3\(b2\)](#) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.3.html), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Oronzio

5300 Arete Way

Raleigh, NC 27607

Wake County



08 NCAC 17 .0109

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Robert McGee <rjmcgee2011@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:38 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 17.0109

You don't often get email from rjmcgee2011@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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 17.0109 - Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots** for the following reason:

Lack of Clarity: The rule violates the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. 150B-21.9(a)2** because when combining Absentee Mail-in Ballot requirements with Photo ID, coupled with tight cure deadlines, it places an increased administrative and cost burden on the voter. The process needs to be executed flawlessly and requires the staff to support the one-day turn around cycle which is likely to be difficult during this midterm election cycle. Both processes are extremely complex, explicit and the steps are numerous and open to interpretation.

The voter must produce and attach a clear photocopy of an acceptable form of voter ID, which requires either using a home printer/copier or a 3rd party printing service. Because the photo quality may be in question, the image can be less than satisfactory. The tight processing schedule may require in-person delivery of the ballot versus using the postal system. If the photo is not accepted the voter is required to process an exception affidavit. Now the voter's package may face a formal inquiry to ensure the affidavit is not false. This is likely to result in an more delay and could prevent the voter from voting a regular ballot.

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

Respectfully,

Robert McGee
536 Middleton Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Rosemary McGee <rosemary.mcgee47@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:20 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Steele, Adam
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review - 08 NCAC 17.0109

You don't often get email from rosemary.mcgee47@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 Chatham County, NC, writing formally to object to the NCSBE's proposed rule **08 NCAC 17.0109 - Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots** for the following reason:

Lack of Clarity: The rule violates the Clarity standard under **N.C.G.S. 150B-21.9(a)2** because when combining Absentee Mail-in Ballot requirements with Photo ID, coupled with tight cure deadlines, it places an increased administrative and cost burden on the voter. The process needs to be executed flawlessly and requires the staff to support the one-day turn around cycle which is likely to be difficult during this midterm election cycle. Both processes are extremely complex, explicit and the steps are numerous and open to interpretation.

The voter must produce and attach a clear photocopy of an acceptable form of voter ID, which requires either using a home printer/copier or a 3rd party printing service. Because the photo quality may be in question, the image can be less than satisfactory. The tight processing schedule may require in-person delivery of the ballot versus using the postal system. If the photo is not accepted the voter is required to process an exception affidavit. Now the voter's package may face a formal inquiry to ensure the affidavit is not false. This is likely to result in more delay and could prevent the voter from voting a regular ballot.

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

Respectfully,

Rosemary McGee
536 Middleton Place
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Kitz Rickert <kitzrickert@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:45 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: rules@ncsbe
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 17 .0109 Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots

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.

Rules Review Commission:

I am a registered voter in Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed rule 08 NCAC 17 .0109 Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots.

Lack of Authority: The rule violates N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly. The agency is using administrative rules to weaken the statutory protection given to absentee voters who fill out valid exception forms, going beyond what N.C.G.S. Chapter 163 authorizes.

Along with lack of authority, this rule places voter integrity in jeopardy.

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.

Kathleen A Rickert
2709 Legion Avenue
Durham, North Carolina 27707
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Bob Rodriguez <blrodriguez001@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 3:23 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Ascher, Seth M
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 17 .0109 Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots

Importance: High

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 rule 08 NCAC 17 .0109 Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots.

My Objection is **Lack of Authority**: The rule violates **N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1)** by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

The agency is using administrative rules to weaken the statutory protection given to absentee voters who fill out valid exception forms, going beyond what **N.C.G.S. Chapter 163** authorizes.

This rule also places voter integrity in jeopardy.

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.

I also ask that a reply be sent back to me that you received my email.

Sincerely,
Robert G. Rodriguez
2400 Countrywood Rd
Raleigh, NC 27615
Wake County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mark Swallow <mswal2846@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 7:42 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 17.0109 Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots
Attachments: mswal2846.vcf

You don't often get email from mswal2846@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 rule 08 NCAC 17.0109 Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots.

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.

Each and every Board of Elections, regardless if at the County level or the State level, must be non-partisan. This is the only way to instill trust in our elections. This rule would jeopardizes that trust by making it so a majority decision (one where the ruling party has the majority) can decide to throw out a registered citizens ballot. This would, clearly make this a partisan decision. And if there is a legitimate reason to preclude this ballot, then it should be easy to obtain a unanimous decision for whatever that reason is. This rule is dangerous and could easily be used for nefarious purposes.

For the sake of our elections, do not approve this rule!

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.

--

Regards,

Mark E Swallow

email: mwal2846@gmail.com

cell: 919-931-2662

fax: 919-573-9463

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mark McClure <markmcclure888@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2026 1:54 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 17 .0109
Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots

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 .0109 Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots**.

Lack of Authority: The rule violates N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly. The agency is using administrative rules to weaken the statutory protection given to absentee voters who fill out valid exception forms, going beyond what N.C.G.S. Chapter 163 authorizes. In addition, amending the requirement for unanimous agreement and giving a simple partisan majority (3-2) on a county board the power to discard a voter's signed affidavit without a high standard exceeds the administrative authority given by the legislature.

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,

Mark McClure
2326 Englewood Avenue
Durham, NC
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: DJ Oronzio <djodemocracy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 2:28 PM
To: rrc.comments; Ascher, Seth M; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 17 .0109 Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots

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 rule 08 NCAC 17 .0109 Photo Identification for Absentee-By-Mail Ballots (NCSBE Rulemaking Page: <https://www.ncsbe.gov/rules-and-rulemaking>).

Lack of Authority: The rule violates N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(1) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.9.html) by exceeding the administrative authority granted to the agency by the General Assembly.

The agency is using administrative rules to weaken the statutory protection given to absentee voters who fill out valid exception forms, going beyond what N.C.G.S. Chapter 163 (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/ByChapter/Chapter_163.html) authorizes. Along with a lack of authority, this rule places voter integrity in jeopardy.

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.3(b2) (https://www.ncleg.gov/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/BySection/Chapter_150B/GS_150B-21.3.html), this letter serves as my formal written objection and clearly requests that this rule be subjected to review by the legislature.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Oronzio

5300 Arete Way

Raleigh, NC 27607

Wake County



Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 12:26 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — Photo ID 08 NCAC 17 .0109

You don't often get email from tiffany.shubert@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 Durham County, writing to formally object to the NCSBE's proposed rule Photo ID - 08 NCAC 17 .0109:

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

I am specifically concerned about the lack of clarity in the proposed change in section c (2):

"the county board may reject that person's ballot only if the county board finds by majority vote that the affidavit is false."

The rule previously stated that it had to be a unanimous vote that the affidavit is false. A unanimous vote is very clear - all have to agree. Majority vote is not a clear standard, nor is there any stated rationale for this change.

The same concern of lack of clarity holds for a statement in the same section of the rule:

"The notice and opportunity to address the county board provided for in this Subparagraph shall be offered only to those voters for whom a majority of county board members, or more, have identified a specific reason"

It is not clear if the majority have to agree on what that reason is, or if the majority have their own specific reasons.

This lack of clarity will cause confusion and a lack of standardization across BOE.

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,

Tiffany Shubert

1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: TreKeny@outlook.com
Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2026 1:10 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: seth.ascher@oahnc.gov; Wiggs, Travis C; Steele, Adam; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Formal Request for Legislative Review 08 NCAC 17 .00109(c)(1) and (c)(2)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from trekeny@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.

Trey Kennedy
6539 Clarksdale Ln
Durham, NC 27713
August 15th , 2026

N.C. Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

Dear Commissioners:
Chair Representative Parker and
Members: Senators Doran, Dixon, Hahn, Hyde and Nelson
Representatives Loutit, Overton, Powell, and
Rules Coordinators Seth Ascher/ Travis Wiggs and Adam Steele

Re: 08 NCAC 17 .00109(c)(1) and (c)(2) Photo Identification For Absentee-by-Mail Ballots

In the first cited section of the rule above, **(c)(1)** it states " A final determination that the photocopy of the photo identification is not acceptable under Paragraph (a) of this Rule shall require a **unanimous** vote by the county board.."

Whereas in cited section of the rule above, **(c)(2)** it states: "If the voter has completed an affidavit claiming an exception to the identification requirement pursuant to G.S. 163-166.16(d) and is otherwise eligible to vote, the county board may reject that person's ballot only if the county board **unanimously** finds **by majority** vote that the affidavit is false

OBJECTION

This may sound repetitive because it has repeated. . The same situation was in 08 NCAC 17 .00101(a)(e)(1) and (a)(e)(2) Verification Of Photo Identification During In-Person Voting

1. **LACK OF CLARITY** --- Under NC GS 150B-21.9 this rule fails the clear and unambiguous test. It is unclear why a decision needed for a photo ID - something that can be visually seen by all County Board members – and an affidavit – also something that can be visually seen by all County Board members - would require unequal evaluation. Further, why wouldn't the more serious of the offenses – a false affidavit –be the one requiring a unanimous decision. It seems to need some clarification to explain why the lesser situation of the Photo ID, seems more significant to need a unanimous ruling than the more serious situation with the affidavit which could be criminal. Clearly these two situations should be AT LEAST equal. The affidavit certainly needs more input and examination than the Photo ID. The majority on the Photo ID shouldn't apply either as it can be subject to Partisanship without being unanimous. It's my suggestion that both issues be unanimous, but AT minimum, the affidavit. More eyes on a potentially criminal offense.

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.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Keryn Lemedy", written in black ink. The signature is fluid and stylized, with a horizontal line underneath the name.

08 NCAC 18 .0502

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 9:48 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 18 .0502 Curable Deficiencies

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 .0502 Curable Deficiencies

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

I am specifically concerned about (a) (7). I work with many seniors and adults with disabilities. I believe the lack of clarity around the language that the individual needs to use will provide confusion and unequal application across counties.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

08 NCAC 18 .0503

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 9:53 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 18 .0503 Non-Curable Deficiencies

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 Non-Curable Deficiencies

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

I am specifically concerned about (a) (b). The rule is written in such a way that it is not clear if the ballot has more than one deficiency if the county board staff is required to document and communicate one deficiency at a time, or document and communicate all deficiencies at one time. This lack of clarity will result in unequal application across counties.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Mark Swallow <mswal2846@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2026 7:51 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 18.0503 Non-Curable Deficiencies
Attachments: mswal2846.vcf

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 rule 08 NCAC 18.0503 Non-Curable Deficiencies.

[OPTION A — Lack of Clarity]: The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

This rule attempts to address "non-curable deficiencies" in absentee ballots. Item b, section 1 states that "If the deficiency is identified more than three days before the date of the election..." This is ridiculous. First of all, 3 days to send out and then get returned an Absentee Ballot is impossible. Second, what about those that are within the 3 day window? Oh well?

The State Board of Elections should not be focused on preventing voting. It should focused on encouraging voting. This section need to have added to it that if this situation arises, the voter should be

notified and encourage to go to an Early Voting site or vote on Election day. If the reason for Absentee Voting is due to physical issues, ensure they know they can take use of Curbside voting.

The focus needs to be on helping that vote to vote. Not focused on technical complicated voting rules.

Do not approve this rule until this is addressed!

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.

--

Regards,

Mark E Swallow
email: mswal2846@gmail.com
cell: 919-931-2662
fax: 919-573-9463

Burgos, Alexander N

From: TreKeny@outlook.com
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2026 7:44 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: seth.ascher@oahnc.gov; Steele, Adam; SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] SUBJECT: Re: Formal Objection to Rule: 08 NCAC 18 .0503(b)(1)
Importance: High

You don't often get email from trekeny@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.

Trey Kennedy
6539 Clarksdale Ln
Durham, NC 27713
April 14th, 2026

N.C. Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Rd.
Raleigh, NC 27609

Members of the Commission:

I am a registered Durham County voter. I raise the following objections **to Rule 08 NCAC 18 .0503 Non-Curable Deficiencies**

OBJECTIONS Part **(b)(1)** of this rule violates the Administrative Procedures Act 150(B)-19.1 in two instances. Under G.S. **150B -19.1(a)(1)** – An agency may adopt only rules that are expressly authorized by Federal or State law and that are **necessary to serve the Public Interest**.

LACK OF AUTHORITY

This rule does not serve the Public Interest. Using Postal Mail will disqualify the voter by not allowing enough time for the voter to cure their spoiled ballot. In calling, or emailing (if those were provided) the short processing time-line left should be explained, but in the event that neither has been provided, the Postal Mailing alone is insufficient, even on perfect execution, and should be changed. The Postal Mail time-line could also be disparaging and arbitrary in rural parts of the state, that may not have consistency in the flow of mailings, internet or cell tower service or access. The time line should be adjusted and a phone number **required** from absentee applicants for quick access.

The second violation is under G.S. **150B -19.1(a)(2)** – An Agency **shall** seek to **reduce the burden** upon those entities who must comply with the rule.

LACK OF AUTHORITY

This rule does **not** reduce the burden, but in fact increases the burden by sending out the absentee ballot package **by Postal Mailing** in the specified time-frame, will slow the process of compliance so that the voter cannot submit a new absentee ballot in the time allotted. It would thereby limit a voter's right to vote. That's limiting the vote; not making voting more accessible.

Even if the Postal Mail process was flawless, the deficiency discovered on the 3rd day before Election Day, and mailed out the same day, it is an unworkable time-line. "Absentee" also indicates that the voter may actually **not** be at home to receive it. The time-line needs to change, and absentee voters should be required to include a reliable phone number (any number they designate) for adequate notification on a spoiled ballot to enter their vote.

I request that the above rule(s) be reviewed in the upcoming legislative session as set out in N.C.G.S. 150B-21.3(b2). I further request that the rule(s) be subject to a delayed effective date as set out in that same provision.

Thank you for your consideration.
Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Keny L. Kennedy", written in black ink.

08 NCAC 18 .0504

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 10:02 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Subject: Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 18 .0504 Irregularities That Do Not Require Further Action From The Voter

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 .0504 Irregularities That Do Not Require Further Action From The Voter

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

I am specifically concerned about (a) (2). First, I want to say that it is very common for people to bring important pieces of mail in larger envelopes to protect the contents. The rule is written in such a way that it is not clear if the voter brings their absentee ballot in an unsealed return envelope or in any other protective carrying device like folder or mailing box, if the ballot will be accepted. This lack of clarity will result in unequal application across counties.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County

08 NCAC 18 .0505

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Tiffany Shubert <tiffany.shubert@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 10:14 AM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: SVC_SBOE.RuleMaking
Subject: [External] Written Objection and Request for Legislative Review — 08 NCAC 18 .0505 Irregularities That Require Further Action

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 .0505 Irregularities That Require Further Action

The rule fails the Clarity standard under N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.9(a)(2) because it fails to define objective standards for county boards, leading to unequal application across counties.

I am concerned about the lack of clarity in several sections of this rule. In particular, section (a) (3), stating "the ballot that the voter is not eligible to vote". This will cause confusion and unequal application across counties for the 30% of North Carolina voters who are unaffiliated. The previous wording was clear that an issue exists if the ballot returned was not the same that was transmitted. The current wording leaves the opportunity for unequal application across counties if there is not consistent documentation of the preferred ballots for the unaffiliated voter. This lack of clarity will result in unequal application across counties.

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,

Tiffany Shubert
1 Coggins Mine Court
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
Durham County