



Written Statement: House Elections Committee Hearing, June 20th, 2023

<p>Bill Richardson, Pure Integrity for Michigan Elections, Legislative Committee Chair</p> <p>https://www.pureintegritymichiganelections.org/ purintegrityforme@gmail.com</p> <p>In support of this statement: Freedom Alliance Project, Stand Up Michigan, and Michigan Fair Elections</p>	<p>Before the Michigan House Standing Committee on Elections, Representative Tsernoglou, Chair</p> <p>Tuesday, June 20th, 2023, 10:30 AM, Room 327, House Office Building, Lansing, MI</p> <p>Committee Clerk: Edward Sleeper Phone: (517) 373-2002 e-Mail: esleeper@house.mi.gov</p>
--	--

This statement, submitted by Pure Integrity for Michigan Elections, comes with the support of the Freedom Alliance Project, Stand Up Michigan, and Michigan Fair Elections. PIME is an issue-based, nonpartisan political movement. We welcome all who support election integrity and the US and Michigan Constitutions.

AGENDA:

HB 4210 Elections: absent voters; electronic return of absent voter ballots by military voters and their spouses; provide for.

PIME POSITION: OPPOSE

Active military personnel are granted the convenience of email voting because while on active duty overseas, they may be serving on a front line or during wartime in a fox hole, or in a classified location to protect our country. Active military spouses remain at a physical address where they may receive their Absentee Voter Ballot (AVB). There is nothing preventing the spouse from receiving their AVB to their residence.

There are a significant number of things that could go wrong with HB4210 that would compromise the integrity of Michigan's election system:

- Significant risk to open our election system up to email hacking and fraud.
- Removes the signature verification step because signatures cannot be verified by email.
- No physical address to a Michigan residence is required.
- No proof of residency is required such as driver's license, state issued ID, or utility bill.

Dr. J. Alex Halderman, professor in the computer science and engineering department at the University of Michigan, **whom Secretary of State Benson appointed as co-chair of Michigan's Cyber Security advisory committee** testified against

this bill on May 9th, 2023. He warned against the risks this bill would impose to Michigan's election integrity and said **"HB4210 would seriously undermine the security of Michigan elections"**. Dr. Halderman's testimony can be viewed here: [Dr.HaldermanHB4210testimony](#)

HB 4534 Corrections: parole; certain voting information on release; require department of corrections to provide.

PIME POSITION: NEUTRAL

HB 4755 Criminal procedure: sentencing guidelines; sentencing guidelines for certain Michigan election law violations; update references. TIE BAR 4756

PIME POSITION: OPPOSE

This bill removes "Disclosing election result or how ballot voted" as a felony. Anyone voting in favor of this bill must think voter fraud is okay and should not be punished. This is not how we convince people that their votes count in our Michigan elections.

HB 4756 Elections: absent voters; processing and tabulation of absent voter ballots during the early voting period; allow, and allow an absent voter to tabulate the absent voter's ballot in person at a polling place or early voting site.

PIME POSITION: OPPOSE

This bill is making numerous changes to the absentee voter ballot processing. There doesn't seem to be a clear motivation for this other than to further harm election integrity in Michigan. PIME sees many issues with this bill, including at a minimum the following:

- Only 1 challenger for every 6 or 8 election inspectors. This removes the ability of challengers to observe all election tables and operations as outlined in prior established rules.
- Tabulators in these election day vote centers will essentially need to accept a ballot from any precinct in the jurisdiction – PIME has warned against the mixing of ballots in prior testimony.
- Explicitly forbids election inspectors from doing any return envelope signature verification. Why?
- Removes requirement that clerk post total number of AV ballots received at 9pm on election day. Why? What is the logic in this other than to allow late additions to the absentee voter count, putting into further question our election results.
- 'no limit' for the number of precincts that can be present at an AVCB location. PIME does not support the push to 'centralize' elections and believes voters should be able to vote in their own neighborhood with election workers they are familiar with. THIS inspires confidence in our process, not sending the voters somewhere further from home to work with someone they don't know in an unfamiliar place.

- Only one inspector from each major party required to be in attendance at an AVCB counting board. This would allow only one inspector for one party be present and hundreds from the other party and still be legal - removes political balance requirement in our existing law. Again, why?
- Tabulated AVCB ballots are required to be placed in sealed ballot containers only AFTER ALL ballots have been tabulated.

SB 339 Elections: absent voters; absent voter ballot and application tracking system; create

PIME POSITION: OPPOSE as written.

PIME has testified in the Senate ‘Elections and Ethics’ committee regarding this bill twice. While we agree with the intent of providing absentee voters a way to track the progress of their absentee ballot, we see several issues with the current language. Some examples are:

- SB0339 bill gives the SOS complete control to “*establish, acquire, or approve an electronic system*” to do this tracking.
 - PIME does not believe such power should be given to a partisan office.
 - PIME has advocated that a bi-partisan committee be established to perform this task, consisting not only of legislators, but also clerks.
- A late amendment to the bill would allow anyone “authorized by the SOS to maintain the electronic tracking system” access to voter’s email address and telephone #'s.
 - This adds more risk of sharing voters’ private personal information with people who don’t need it, raising concerns of identity theft and other manipulation using people’s private information.

SB 367 Elections; voting procedures; early voting procedures; provide for and clarify.

PIME POSITION: OPPOSE as written.

PIME understands legislation must be written to enact Proposal 2. However, we have many concerns with the current language in this bill. Here are some examples:

1. There is no language to protect minority groups, who have a much lower turnout when they are forced to drive further to the polls. A study published by houstonpublicmedia.org determined that a one-mile increase in a drive to the polls reduced voter turnout for people of color by 19%, while only reducing white voter turnout by 5%. Language to protect voters from long drives was in early drafts of the bill, but has been removed.
2. Too much authority is being given to a partisan office, namely the SOS office.

- PIME has proposed a bi-partisan committee be established made up of legislators and clerks to design and develop systems required by the early voting amendment.
 - Our constitution requires the legislature determine the “time, place, and manner” of the elections, not the SOS.
3. Current draft allows “print on demand” ballots. The very same type of ballots that caused major voter suppression in AZ in last year’s November election.
 4. Current draft allows different ballot types to be tabulated in the same tabulator. This does not promote confidence in our election process and would make recounts very difficult for canvassers. PIME supports one tabulator per ballot type.
 5. Allows up to 29 days for early voting! The 9 day requirement allowed in Proposal 2 is plenty. Extending this to a voting ‘month’ or ‘season’ only works to defeat voter’s confidence in election results and is a waste of taxpayer dollars. Voters voted on 9 days, not 29 days.
 6. Current draft allows for daily updates to e-poll books and the QVF. There are obvious concerns with tracking who has voted and who is registered when the list is changing daily across the state. The process should remain as it has always been, with a final QVF loaded into the e-poll book at the beginning of the election process and not changing until the election is over.

SB 370

Elections; absent voters; signature matching and curing for absent voter ballot applications and absent voter ballot return envelopes; provide for, and provide for modifications to the absent voter ballot application and process.

PIME POSITION: OPPOSE as written.

PIME has many concerns with this bill as written:

1. You seem to be waiving the signature requirement for an AVB application by allowing it to happen online (sec 759(1))
2. The bill would allow a voter to ‘cure’ a ballot that has been rejected and have it counted in the election up until 5:00 pm on the **3rd day AFTER THE ELECTION**. [new section 761(3)]. We simply cannot keep extending the time frame of accepting ballots past election day. This does not bolster confidence in our election results.
3. Electronic signatures would be allowed not only on the absentee ballot application, but also on any required ‘cure’ forms. This seems terribly easy to ‘hack’.
4. “The SOS may issue instructions to clerks to provide electors with other options, **other than by providing a signature.**” [sec 766a(6)]
 - This is another effort to avoid signature verification and more control being put into a partisan office (SOS).
5. The workload being added to the clerks in this bill is astonishing and much of it is not necessary. There is a lot of ‘talk’ about helping the clerks do their job, but the ‘actions’ required in this bill and others prove the opposite is happening.

SB 371 Criminal procedure: sentencing guidelines; sentencing guidelines for certain Michigan election law violations; update references.

PIME POSITION: SUPPORT.

SB 373 Elections; voters; definition of identification for election purposes; expand.

PIME POSITION: OPPOSE

Introducing the “educational institution” definition to include any accrediting institution lowers the standard for ID requirements. **72% of Michigan voters support voter ID laws.** Any ID that doesn’t contain at least the information required on the “application to vote” at the polls should not be allowed as a voting ID. Section (g) should be removed and the old section k(ix) should be un-struck.

<https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/michigan-voters-support-voter-id-58-percent-black-voters>

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Richardson, Chair, Legislative Committee Pure Integrity Michigan Elections	Allies: Stand Up Michigan Freedom Alliance Project Michigan Fair Elections
--	--

	
 <p>FREEDOM ALLIANCE PROJECT</p>	