

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMPILATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Submitted to the Committee on Elections  
For HB 357

Compiled on: Thursday, March 16, 2023 1:20 PM

Note: Comments received by the committee reflect only the view of the individual(s) submitting the comment, who retain sole responsibility for the content of the comment. Neither the committee nor the Texas House of Representatives takes a position on the views expressed in any comment. The committee compiles the comments received for informational purposes only and does not exercise any editorial control over comments.

---

Hearing Date: March 16, 2023 10:30 AM - or upon final adjourn./recess or bill referral if permission granted

Sid Hooper  
self...retired  
Pharr, TX  
NO!

Tim Lance  
self - retired educator  
Austin, TX

I am totally in favor of this bill. My last 5 years were as the technology support person for an elementary school of 900+ kids and their teachers, admin, support. No matter the site/service, the number of times such a design as we currently have caused issues was too high and totally unnecessary, and I am referring to adults. When considering the importance of our vote even one voter having an issue is too many.

Kimberly Bridges Young  
Self and Election Integrity Project of Nueces County  
Corpus Christi, TX

I'm not in favor of this bill. I wasn't in favor of the SB 1 law that was passed that allowed a requestor for a mail-in-ballot to only provide their driver's license number or their last 4 digits of their social security number. This new proposed bill makes those 2 forms consistent across the online ballot curing process. If a person posing as the voter had the voter's drivers license number or their last 4, then the crime can be continued online, too. The actual curing process is suspect, too, because it keeps the potential illegal activity in the hands of the potential criminal, rather than allowing the evidence to be retained by the ballot board judge. What was missing in SB 1 was the requirement of a legally vetted signature on a copy of the voter's driver's license or other legal photo ID. Let's not take this insecure law any further by allowing it online, too.

Pamela Woods

Election Integrity Project of Nueces County  
Corpus Christi, TX

I am not in favor of this bill and this is why: 1.) I was not in favor of the SB 1 law that passed allowing a requestor to request a mail in ballot by only providing a Driver's license number or the last 4 digits of their SS#, rather than a vetted legal signature from the legal photo ID. This new proposed bill makes those 2 new "forms of ID" consistent across the online ballot curing process.  
2) If some one else other than the voter has these numbers, then the crime can be continued online, too. 3) The curing process is looking suspect, as well. The process keeps the potential illegal activity in the hands of the potential criminal, rather than allowing the illegal ballot to be retained by the ballot board judge as evidence.  
What is missing: in SB 1: requirement of a legally vetted signature on a copy of the voters driver's license or other legal photo ID. HB 357 allows this insecure process to be continued online.  
Some of this language is in SB 1599, my comments apply there as well.  
Pamela Woods

Paul Laudadio

Self and Election Integrity Project of Nueces County  
Corpus Christi, TX

HB 357

I'm not in favor of this bill. I wasn't in favor of the SB 1 law that was passed that allowed a requestor for a mail-in-ballot to only provide their driver's license number or their last 4 digits of their social security number, rather than a legally vetted signature on a legal photo ID. And this new proposed bill makes those 2 new "forms of ID" consistent across the online ballot curing process. If someone else other than the voter has these numbers, then the crime can be continued online, too. The actual curing process is suspect, too, because it keeps the potential illegal activity in the hands of the potential criminal, rather than allowing the illegal ballot to be retained by the ballot board judge as evidence. What was missing in SB 1 was the requirement of a legally vetted signature on a copy of the voter's driver's license or other legal photo ID. Let's not take this insecure law any further by allowing it online, too. Some of this same language is in SB 1599, and my same comments apply there, as well.

Kelley Burnett

Myself and Nueces Co Election Integrity Project CCDF  
Corpus Christi, TX

I'm not in favor of this bill. I wasn't in favor of the SB 1 law that was passed that allowed a requestor for a mail-in-ballot to only provide their driver's license number or their last 4 digits of their social security number, rather than a legally vetted signature on a legal photo ID. And this new proposed bill makes those 2 new "forms of ID" consistent across the online ballot curing process. If someone else other than the voter has these numbers, then the crime can be continued online, too. The actual curing process is suspect, too, because it keeps the potential illegal activity in the hands of the potential criminal, rather than allowing the illegal ballot to be retained by the ballot board judge as evidence. What was missing in SB 1 was the requirement of a legally vetted signature on a copy of the voter's driver's license or other legal photo ID. Let's not take this insecure law any further by allowing it online, too. Some of this same language is in SB 1599, and my same comments apply there, as well.

Natalie Olsson

SELF, RETIRED  
Corpus Christi, TX

I'm not in favor of this bill. I wasn't in favor of the SB 1 law that was passed that allowed a requestor for a mail-in-ballot to only provide their driver's license number or their last 4 digits of their social security number, rather than a legally vetted signature on a legal photo ID. And this new proposed bill makes those 2 new "forms of ID" consistent across the online ballot curing process. If someone else other than the voter has these numbers, then the crime can be continued online, too. The actual curing process is suspect, too, because it keeps the potential illegal activity in the hands of the potential criminal, rather than allowing the illegal ballot to be retained by the ballot board judge as evidence. What was missing in SB 1 was the requirement of a legally vetted signature on a copy of the voter's driver's license or other legal photo ID. Let's not take this insecure law any further by allowing it online, too. Some of this same language is in SB 1599, and my same comments apply there, as well.

Michael Rittgers  
Self - Retired  
Corpus Christi, TX

HB 357

I'm not in favor of this bill. I wasn't in favor of the SB 1 law that was passed that allowed a requestor for a mail-in-ballot to only provide their driver's license number or their last 4 digits of their social security number, rather than a legally vetted signature on a legal photo ID. And this new proposed bill makes those 2 new "forms of ID" consistent across the online ballot curing process. If someone else other than the voter has these numbers, then the crime can be continued online, too. The actual curing process is suspect, too, because it keeps the potential illegal activity in the hands of the potential criminal, rather than allowing the illegal ballot to be retained by the ballot board judge as evidence. What was missing in SB 1 was the requirement of a legally vetted signature on a copy of the voter's driver's license or other legal photo ID. Let's not take this insecure law any further by allowing it online, too.

Jayme Burkhart  
Self  
Katy, TX

I'm not in favor of this bill. I wasn't in favor of the SB 1 law that was passed that allowed a requestor for a mail-in-ballot to only provide their driver's license number or their last 4 digits of their social security number, rather than a legally vetted signature on a legal photo ID. And this new proposed bill makes those 2 new "forms of ID" consistent across the online ballot curing process. If someone else other than the voter has these numbers, then the crime can be continued online, too. The actual curing process is suspect, too, because it keeps the potential illegal activity in the hands of the potential criminal, rather than allowing the illegal ballot to be retained by the ballot board judge as evidence. What was missing in SB 1 was the requirement of a legally vetted signature on a copy of the voter's driver's license or other legal photo ID. Let's not take this insecure law any further by allowing it online, too. Some of this same language is in SB 1599, and my same comments apply there, as well.

ARTHUR NORMAN

Self and Election Integrity Project of Nueces County  
Corpus Christi, TX

I am against this bill. Although the proposed changes to the election code add the requirement for the voters date of birth to access to the online tracking system, it appears to make it less secure by removing the requirement to also provide the last 4 of the voters SSN. Thank You!

Guy Saponari  
Self and Election Integrity Project of Nueces County.  
corpus christi, TX

Nn not in favor. bill will make elections less secure.

Valerie Street  
Our Vote Texas  
Austin, TX

On behalf of Our Vote Texas, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated to voter education and voter rights advocacy in the state of Texas, I write to urge members of the committee to support HB 357 and pass it out of committee.

Our Vote Texas provides voter resources that give Texas voters helpful information about the basics of voting. We also advocate for reforms that improve voting and elections in terms of both access and process.

HB 357 is a bill that seeks to improve access to the statewide ballot by mail tracking system by simplifying it for Texas voters. The implementation of the statewide online mail-in-ballot tracker has been an important step forward for Texas and HB 357 seeks to better its functionality by streamlining the access requirements for Texans to successfully make use of it.

Under the proposal, voters would need to provide their name, date of birth, and either their Texas DL/DPS number OR the last 4 digits of their SS.

We support HB 357 because it helps build out a useful tool for Texas voters to be able to better track their ballot as it moves through the process and make sure their vote counts.

We urge members to vote in favor of this bill and I thank you for your time and efforts to serve the people of Texas.

Darcie Wilbanks  
Self and Conservative Values Project  
Houston, TX

I'm not in favor of this bill as it's written. I wasn't in favor of the SB 1 law that was passed that allowed a requestor for a mail-in-ballot to only provide their driver's license number or their last 4 digits of their social security number, rather than a legally vetted signature on a legal photo ID. And this new proposed bill makes those 2 new "forms of ID" consistent across the online ballot curing process. If someone else other than the voter has these numbers, then the crime can be continued online, too. The actual curing process is suspect, too, because it keeps the potential illegal activity in the hands of the potential criminal, rather than allowing the illegal ballot to be retained by the ballot board judge as evidence. What was missing in SB 1 was the requirement of a legally vetted signature on a copy of the voter's driver's license or other legal photo ID. Let's not take this insecure law any further by allowing it online, too. Some of this same language is in SB 1599, and my same comments apply there, as well.

Robert Jacoby  
Dallas County Republican Party Election Integrity Committee  
Addison, TX

Dear Committee,  
Are the proposed changes to help the actual voter? Or to help the "vote organizer or vote harvester?"

I think an address, and last four digits of SS# are more secure than a birth date. B (1) one is fine as is. I am ok with the modest change of B (2).

Marc Hoskins  
Disability Rights Texas  
Austin, TX

I think the address that is on record can throw people off, especially if they are older and are living at a residential facility and don't remember where they were last registered.

Robert Garay  
Self  
Houston, TX

Dear Members of the Elections Committee,

My name is Robert Garay and I am providing testimony ON HB 357. I live in TX House District 143, which is in Harris County.

I do agree that the removal of the voter's registration address and adding the date of birth requirement from the online search tool will help alleviate concerns about not finding a record of your mail-in ballot.

As someone who has worked in a business capacity on address validation with customers and vendors, there are too many location name standards and variables by which an address can be truly resolved once it is entered into the state registration database.

Where I'm unsure on fully supporting the bill is requiring only ONE of the driver license/identification number or last 4 of the SSN. I believe both should be required to ensure the true voter can be identified through the online portal.

In principle, we should align the same information requirements of submitting a mail-in ballot with tracking your ballot online with the state.

Thank you for your attention, consideration, and the opportunity to provide public comment.

Sarah Berel-Harrop  
Self / Director of Religious Education & Intern Minister  
Farmers Branch, TX

I support this bill making it more streamlined for voters to use the online ballot tracker.