

To the Elections & Ethics Committee for consideration on September 21, 2021 of House Bills 5258, 5252, 5288, and 5268:

HB 5258 – This bill provides for electronic transmission of proof copies of ballots to candidates and to the Secretary of State and increases the proof ballot “window” from 14 days prior to a primary for a county clerk to no less than 58 days prior to a primary.

The more time given to our county clerks to work with candidates on proof ballots, the better. The ability to use electronic means to communicate with candidates is a sizable plus in terms of response time that we have available in today’s technological world. These are both good proposals that I see only as a benefit to our county clerks. **SUPPORT**

HB 5252 – This bill proposes the Secretary of State post on the department of state’s website a summary of any petitions filed and the date it was filed with the SOS as well as 30-day status updates.

This provides transparency and accountability and should be fairly easy and inexpensive to implement. **SUPPORT**

HB 5288 – This bill proposes the prohibition of electronic signatures on AV ballot applications and further prohibits the availability of online av ballot applications where a physical signature is not required.


Physical signatures should be required. Online AV applications presented through QVF are still subject to signature review. Many voters may not realize this and see the signature populate and assume all is good. It’s too easy for many individuals (especially spouses) to share information or just know the other’s information, log on, and request with a pre-populated signature field. This method is too susceptible to fraud regarding the issuance of an AV ballot application and signatures. **SUPPORT**

HB 5268 – This bill proposes the prohibition of any clerk and the Secretary of State from sending out any unsolicited AV ballot applications to any elector(s).

ONLY as prescribed in law should an AV ballot application be sent to any elector. In 2020, voters could have easily requested an AV ballot application and one would have been sent. The confusion and comments that the mass mailing caused was totally unfair to the front line (local) clerks. And further, if clerks are required to follow law on issuing AV ballot applications, then those that created and seek conformity of that law by clerks, should follow the same regulations and processes. **SUPPORT**

Respectfully submitted,

Tonya A. Miller, City Clerk

City of Tecumseh  *Tecumseh*