




Fri 9/4/2020 11:41 AM

Bell, Karen B <Karen.Bell@ncsbe.gov>

RE: [External] FW: NY & NC Election Officials Ignore Evidence of Interstate Double-Vote Fraud

To Rep. George Cleveland; jay@voterintegrityproject.com

Cc Love, Katelyn; Gannon, Patrick

 You forwarded this message on 9/4/2020 3:02 PM.

Good morning Rep. Cleveland, (cc: Jay DeLancy, Katelyn Love, and Patrick Gannon)

Thank you for bringing this to my attention as Mr. DeLancy did not. He only emailed two members of the state board staff – our General Counsel, Katelyn Love, and our PIO, Patrick Gannon. Upon sending the one email, he did not follow up with either individual nor did he follow up with me before drafting his press release or reaching out to you. While we appreciate the research he has completed and take his work seriously, the encryption is also something that we take very seriously and by our security procedures we are cautious of any email with such criteria, even when received from individuals we have previously communicated with at other times.

Ms. Love and Mr. Gannon have been attentive to other major priorities for the agency this week, which they have had direct responsibility to carry out in the past week including but not limited to:

- The complete revision, move to a more secure platform, and launch of our new website on 8/27, the very day of Mr. DeLancy's email
- An day long State Board Meeting on 8/31 to consider 18 non-unanimous one-stop early voting plans in addition to other matters on the board's agenda
- The launch of our absentee by mail request portal on 9/1 as we were directed by the legislature in Session Law 2020-17
- Response to more than 100 media inquiries yesterday alone because of North Carolina's unique position of being the first in the nation to mail out absentee by mail ballots today and comments by the President during his visit to North Carolina on 9/2
- Two court cases that required briefs, declarations, and/or affidavits to courts yesterday
- Finalizing the BallotTrax absentee by mail tracking system, which were are also launching with the start of absentee by mail voting
- Investigating a possible issue with our voter information on the dark web, which we fortunately found to be false but nonetheless required significant attention by the agency to ensure this was the case
- Supporting the 100 county boards of elections as they prepare to respond to more than 600,000 absentee by mail requests already received in addition to all the other work involved with carrying out the election in the next 60 days.

These matters to do not lessen the importance of Mr. DeLancy's email but they do illustrate how, as a very small agency, we must prioritize our work and ensure first and foremost that we meet statutory deadlines. Given that Mr. DeLancy consistently follows the work of our agency, I believe he is more aware than most citizens of the work and deadlines we are managing at this point. It is unfortunate that he did not reach out to Ms. Love or Mr. Gannon as he has done in the past when he has not received a response. Setting this aside, I have asked Ms. Love and Mr. Gannon to reach out to Mr. DeLancy when they have opportunity in the midst of all other matters they are attending to.

My apologies that this has taken time away from your busy schedule as well.

I wish you a wonderful holiday weekend and thank you,
Karen

Karen Brinson Bell

Executive Director

(919) 814-0700



Counties should note that these processes are the only approved processes for removing voters from the registration rolls due to a change in residency. A state statute permits challenges to an individual voters' registration due to a purported change in residency (G.S. 163-85(c)), but a federal court has forbidden the State and county boards of elections from allowing such challenges. The court concluded that removing voters who change address through the challenge process violates federal law—the NVRA. See Numbered Memo 2018-07.

1. **No voter challenges based on change of residency.** Do not remove a voter from the rolls when a voter challenge is brought based on change of residency. Do not hold a hearing or take any other action to consider a voter challenge based on a voter's change of residency.¹
2. **No voter challenges based on other qualifications without individualized knowledge within the 90 days before an election.** Do not remove a voter from the rolls within the 90 days preceding a federal election based on a voter challenge brought without an "individualized inquiry as to the circumstances of each voter." Do not hold a hearing or take any other action to consider a voter challenge that is brought without an individualized inquiry by the challenger.





**READ MY LIPS...
NO MORE HIDING**



HB 259 Primary Sponsors



George G.
Cleveland (R)



Kyle Hall (R)



Keith Kidwell (R)



Jeffrey C.
McNeely (R)