

From: Lori Shellenberger [<mailto:shellenbergerl@brennan.law.nyu.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 8:05 PM
To: ToulouseOliver, Maggie, SOS <Maggie.TOliver@state.nm.us>; Curtas, Alex, SOS <Alex.Curtas@state.nm.us>
Subject: [EXT] Proposed rule re notice and cure of absentee ballot defects

Hi Secretary and Alex,

It was great to speak with – and see – both of you last week. I was trying to look at your proposed rule regarding the absentee ballot notice and cure process, and noticed the link was down. If for some reason you are making any edits and re-posting, I did have a few suggestions:

- 1) It would be good to specify that notice should be given in the voter's preferred language;
- 2) You may want to specify the deadline for curing (which I read as being until the Friday before the state canvas board meets); and
- 3) You may want to require that one contact be a mailed notice – it's counterintuitive, but this [Stanford study of 2018 California mail ballot cure data](#) showed, on p. 39, that cure letters are the most effective tool for getting voters to cure:

Finding: Follow-up cure letters are the single most effective tool for improving cure rates, far greater than using other forms of notification like email and phone. We received 2018 challenge and remedy numbers from twelve counties: Amador, Contra Costa, Humboldt, Kern, Los Angeles, Marin, Napa, Sacramento, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Sonoma, comprising 45% of the state population and ranging from the 21st percentile of county size to the 100th percentile. Counties did not collect this data prior to the EVCA, limiting our observations solely to the 2018 election cycle. Six of the twelve counties practice multiple forms of remedy notification (email, mail, phone), while the other six only use USPS mail. Of the mail-only counties, Marin and Santa Clara also follow up a second time by letter with voters who do not respond to the first notification. Based on the summary statistics alone, mail-only notification is more effective than using multiple forms of notification, and is augmented by sending a second follow-up letter. Counties that used multiple forms had a mean remedy rate of 35% versus a 44% mean for mail-only counties. If we exclude the follow-up-letter counties, the mail-only counties are nearly even with multiple-form counties, 36% remedy versus 35%.

Let me know if you have any questions, and thanks again for your time last week!

Lori
Lori Shellenberger
Advisor, Voting Rights & Elections Program
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law
120 Broadway, Suite 1750
New York, New York 10271
917.226.0514 (m)
shellenbergerl@brennan.law.nyu.edu

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email.