

Andrea Gyger

From: Bennett Rutledge [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 9:20 AM
To: SoS Rulemaking
Cc: openforum@denverpost.com
Subject: Comments on Colorado Secretary of State Proposed Election Rules

Mr. Williams,

First off, let me apologize for not having researched this as thoroughly as I should have. Nor have I had time to get feedback from enough party officials to have these comments be more than just my own. You only sent out the notice a week before today's deadline ... just when the Legislature had adjourned and I thought we might be safe from confusing new rules.

I have a number of concerns about your proposed changes to the rules, mostly where you are "implementing propositions 107 and 108" but putting no boundary between rules for primaries, which are what 107 and 108 are about, and rules applying much more broadly. These include

- imposing requirements on traditional voter registration drives,
- cutting off information needed to get out the vote,
- having taxpayer-paid officials do the training (and certification???) of party workers.
- forbidding party workers, but no other persons, from "ANY MOBILE PHONE OR OTHER ELECTRONIC DEVICE..." at polls.
- tightening Secretary of State control over post-election audits, including decreeing a lack thereof, and
- dictating when information on election results may or may not be released by local governments.

Worse, I am totally baffled that written complaints may only be lodged "about a voting device." And while I am not inherently opposed to voter convenience, I am not sure what is gained by voters being permitted to do in-person voting not just in a different precinct or town, but a different county.

I was planning to spend most of this response on Rule 5, covering Presidential Electors, and how it is brazen defiance of Section 5 of the Colorado Bill of Rights: requiring the Oath, declaring a duly elected Elector has vacated, filling the vacancy, all of it. But instead, I'll simply remind you of how easily voters are put in a "throw the bums out" mood and ask you this:

Do you, Mr. Williams, as an official elected by the people of Colorado to do a job, REALLY want to codify the precedent you set with Micheal Baca, that a person, duly elected to do a job by the people of Colorado, may have his/her vote blocked, or even be stripped of that job entirely? And not just for moral turpitude or high crimes, but for not voting according to a promise made at the beginning of her/his campaign for office? With no consideration of what may have changed since the promise was made? With no review or appeal?

I'll have to remember that choice phrase "failure to act"! Part of its magic is, it seems to work even when the person *has* been acting ... doing the job ... just not the way somebody else likes!

Bennett Rutledge
Treasurer & Registered Agent
P. O. Box 3492
Littleton, CO 80161



cc. The Denver Post