

Dear Commission Secretary Haas,

I vote NO on the regulations below.

R200-22 : Applies unequal standards across counties in order to create punitive regulations for counties that use paper ballots and hand counts. It exempts counties who do not use these more secure voting methods from common sense safeguards, such as the removal of all blue/black ink marking devices from the vicinity of live ballots. Finally, this measure further delays the count of ballots and release of results. Nevada is already a national laughingstock for our slow results. Ballots should be continuously counted until finished, not have arbitrary working times limiting them. If they do have arbitrary times limiting the count, they need to be applied to all counties equally.

R008-23 : Imposes unfunded mandate on counties for a Presidential Preference Primary the state has acknowledged in court is meaningless. If the state wants to hold meaningless, non-binding elections, it should pay for the entire cost.

R009-23 : Expands voting by email to tribal lands with no oversight. Also allows any voter to 'challenge' a Presidential nominee from appearing on the ballot. The author of this regulation has been deliberately hidden by the Legislative Counsel Bureau and withheld from the public.

R011-23 : Removes chain of custody safeguards on mail in ballots and adds restrictions on poll watchers who provide essential election oversight and safeguards. This also fails to include any reporting to the public of delayed opening of election sites, even though delayed openings resulted in court action against Clark County in 2018, 2020, and 2022.

R012-23 : Eliminates basic chain of custody requirements for tracking ballots and mechanical voting devices. This eliminates existing requirements to track who is transporting ballots and mechanical voting devices. Our votes will have less security than an Amazon package if this is passed.

R013-23 : This appears to provide an exemption to the crime of voting twice for voters voting electronically, if the clerk or registrar determines it was done 'inadvertently'. How is intent determined? It is not included in this regulation. As electronically submitted ballots are by definition, not secret, why would the election official not contact the voter to determine which ballot should be processed instead?

R014-23 : Two names - unequal treatment. Jacob Williams in AD25 was not a registered Republican, falsified a registration form, and was given a special exception to be allowed to run. Nicole Sirotek in AD33 was not a registered Republican, incorrectly stated she was a Republican on her registration form after being told at the DMV she was a registered Republican, and was removed from the ballot. If a candidate does not verify their party registration before running for office, they should not be allowed to run - no matter what. When a candidate declares their candidacy, they have to sign an oath of office to uphold the platform of the party they affiliate with. If they did not bother to register and maintain registration, they are falsifying a document and cannot represent our party. 2022 already had separate but equal treatment applied, and it's outrageous. No one who is NOT a registered member of their party should be allowed to run. The issues with Automatic Voter Registration are widespread and certainly cause for concern - but that means that candidates seeking office have a responsibility to ensure their voter registration is correct.

I am writing in today to ask you vote no on the regulations listed below. These are not good regulations - these were crafted in secret, not subject to transparency laws that govern all other governmental entities in Nevada. When pushed for disclosure, the secretive LCB refused to state who produced them. These weaken elections in Nevada, and make it easier to cheat. Please see my detailed concerns below.

As a voter in your district, I ask you to vote NO on the regulations below.

R200-22 : Applies unequal standards across counties in order to create punitive regulations for counties that use paper ballots and hand counts. It exempts counties who do not use these more secure voting methods from common sense safeguards, such as the removal of all blue/black ink marking devices from the vicinity of live ballots. Finally, this measure further delays the count of ballots and release of results. Nevada is already a national laughingstock for our slow results. Ballots should be continuously counted until finished, not have arbitrary working times limiting them. If they do have arbitrary times limiting the count, they need to be applied to all counties equally.

R008-23 : Imposes unfunded mandate on counties for a Presidential Preference Primary the state has acknowledged in court is meaningless. If the state wants to hold meaningless, non-binding elections, it should pay for the entire cost.

R009-23 : Expands voting by email to tribal lands with no oversight. Also allows any voter to 'challenge' a Presidential nominee from appearing on the ballot. The author of this regulation has been deliberately hidden by the Legislative Counsel Bureau and withheld from the public.

R011-23 : Removes chain of custody safeguards on mail in ballots and adds restrictions on poll watchers who provide essential election oversight and safeguards. This also fails to include any reporting to the public of delayed opening of election sites, even though delayed openings resulted in court action against Clark County in 2018, 2020, and 2022.

R012-23 : Eliminates basic chain of custody requirements for tracking ballots and mechanical voting devices. This eliminates existing requirements to track who is transporting ballots and mechanical voting devices. Our votes will have less security than an Amazon package if this is passed.

R013-23 : This appears to provide an exemption to the crime of voting twice for voters voting electronically, if the clerk or registrar determines it was done 'inadvertently'. How is intent determined? It is not included in this regulation. As electronically submitted ballots are by definition, not secret, why would the election official not contact the voter to determine which ballot should be processed instead?

R014-23 : Two names - unequal treatment. Jacob Williams in AD25 was not a registered Republican, falsified a registration form, and was given a special exception to be allowed to run. Nicole Sirotek in AD33 was not a registered Republican, incorrectly stated she was a Republican on her registration form after being told at the DMV she was a registered Republican, and was removed from the ballot. If a candidate does not verify their party registration before running for office, they should not be allowed to run - no matter what. When a candidate declares their candidacy, they have to sign an oath of office to uphold the platform of the party they affiliate with. If they did not bother to register and maintain registration, they are falsifying a document and cannot represent our party. 2022 already had separate but equal treatment applied, and it's outrageous. No one who is NOT a registered member of their party should be allowed to run. The issues with Automatic Voter Registration are widespread and certainly

cause for concern - but that means that candidates seeking office have a responsibility to ensure their voter registration is correct.

Sincerely,

Ken Lewis
Reno, NV 89502