

Please accept the following comments/questions for proposed Rule 7.2.5 & 7.2.6:

- The provision to delay implementation until January 1, 2015 is appreciated as we have approximately 5000 return envelopes in stock (at a cost of \$725) for the upcoming General Election, and it will likely be difficult to obtain envelope design approval and receive replacement envelopes from our vendor in a timely manner. We would anticipate a higher cost/envelope for the reprint as we received a discount bulk rate on our first order by cooperating with other area counties.
- There are several implementation concerns with 7.2.6 that may require additional rules/direction or perhaps legislation in 2015:
 - If a signature is required on the affirmation similar to the required signature for the affidavit, procedures will need to be drafted in the event that an affirmation is unsigned. Also, would a signature on an affirmation require verification, rejection, or a follow-up letter and process?
 - Is there a potential enforcement problem in treating the voter who drops ballots off in person differently than those who utilize a stand-alone drop-off box or the USPS?
 - It will be difficult to track the persons returning ballots if they appear on multiple days in multiple locations.
 - Would ballot couriers need to show ID to ensure that the third party name on the ballot envelope is the person delivering the ballot?
 - Our current envelope design provides for the signature of the voter to be covered by the envelope flap and our voters would likely appreciate that option for all signature lines if a signature is required.
- Although our return envelope design is clear to those in the election business, our office still fields a significant number of questions on the current design. Adding more content to the back of the return envelope will add to the voter confusion that currently exists.