

Strother, Julie (OSS)

From: Dean <barton55071@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2014 4:18 PM
To: *OAH_RuleComments.OAH; Dean
Subject: SOS - Election rule making rebuttal

Importance: High

To the Hon. Eric L. Lipman, Administrative Law Judge

In response to the written comments submitted regarding the MN SOS proposed rules:

"In evaluating potential additional documents for election day registration, the Office looked to how frequently that document was accepted by other states,"

Minnesota is one of only ten states that offer election or same day registration (SDR). The above statement does not identify whether the Office looked at only states with SDR or all states. The statement also does not address the various policies some of the other states with SDR incorporate - such as voting a provisional ballot. We need to ensure when we are making comparisons that all relevant factors enter into the equation.

"We find it especially meaningful that elections judges who commented overwhelmingly support the proposed rule amendments regarding eligible proofs of residence."

I too have served as an election judge for several election cycles. Based on my experiences, I do not find myself in alignment with the opinions referenced above. There are many election day issues that could and should be addressed; however turning people away due to lack of proper identification is not the area that needs the most focus. The number of SDR people turned away is a very small percentage of the number of people that actually complete the process. The number of people turned away because they do not bring the additional supporting documents is significantly greater than the number of people turned away for not having a MN DL or ID.

When a person is turned away, they are provided with multiple options on how they can still vote. These options include vouching, going to DMV to obtain an updated document or to come back with the proper supporting documents. The premise that additional forms of approved documentation will decrease turning away voters will do nothing to change the issues related to people not doing what is required.

The time, energy and resources being used for this proposed amendment would be better served to evaluate statistics as to why SDR is at 40% or higher in certain communities and why the same issues do not occur in off year elections (e.g., 1 SDR in 2013 at my polling place). Changing the identification process to make thing simpler is not, in my opinion, in the best interest of Minnesota.

Dean Barton