

LPC Poll – February 3, 2025

LD	Support		Oppose		NFNA		Track		NP	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
LD 309, Party Primary	1	3%	13	39%	14	42%	-	-	5	15%
LD 313, Ballot ID	1	3%	26	79%	1	3%	2	6%	3	9%
LD 349, Same Day Reg	6	18%	24	73%	2	6%	-	-	1	3%

Comments

[LD 309](#), *An Act to Allow a Political Party to Determine How That Party's Nominee Is Selected in a Primary Election* (Sponsored by Rep. Boyer of Poland).

Support

- The state should not be inserting itself and interfering with the processes of political corporations.

Oppose

- This will cause so much confusion for staff and voters. Primary elections are already confusing enough since they have been changed to Semi-Open, the method of voting should be kept the same regardless of what the candidate’s preference is. There is distrust when voters are expecting one thing and get another at the polls. If they choose an alternate approach staff will have to be trained and information will have to be pumped out to voters.
- Voter Confusion: Different voting methods between parties could confuse voters and lead to mistakes at the polls. Lack of Standardization: Allowing each party to decide its method creates inconsistency and undermines fairness in the election process. Increased Costs and Complexity: Managing multiple voting systems would add administrative burden and cost to election officials. Risk of Manipulation: Parties could select methods that favor certain candidates or factions, undermining fairness. Decreased Voter Engagement: Uncertainty over voting methods could discourage voter participation. Internal Party Divisions: The introduction of different methods could cause friction and divisions within parties. Erosion of Public Confidence: The bill could be seen as benefiting party insiders, reducing public trust in the fairness of elections.
- I would like MMA to oppose all three of these bills that could create unnecessary action that is likely not in keeping with the will of the majority of Maine's voters. I have not researched it, but strongly suspect that the Secretary of State's office does not support these bills.
- Not a strong feeling, but it potentially creates voter confusion.

- We should NOT be allowing different rules for different groups. Every party should follow the same rules that are put in place by the Secretary of State or by the Constitution.

NFNA

- I think the way that parties manage themselves is up to them; however, it should be very clear that municipalities shouldn't have to change the way elections are run to accommodate the proposed amendment. It seems that the Republicans are looking to avoid ranked choice; if that's their pleasure, I don't see there to be incremental costs to us. Truly, after the last election (especially CD-2), it is evident that ranked choice has a more substantial price tag associated with it.
- The bill may be irrelevant if other proposed bills pass repealing ranked choice voting- LD 234. If ranked choice voting is not repealed, and LD 309 passes, I think that adds another level of confusion because now all elections will not be conducted in the same manner with primaries being the anomaly.
- I can get on board with a NFNA given the political implications. I do oppose the concept. I believe for voter trust and clarity it is best to keep all election materials consistent across parties.

No Position

- I would advise MMA to take no position on LD 309-though I would personally oppose it within my party. I fear it is geared to take political power from voters and place it into party politburo members' hands. I was active years ago in persuading the movement to primaries over caucuses, and incurred some wrath from party functionaries. I still stand by that movement.
- The issue is how they choose to select candidates to run in the election, not about the election itself. The election integrity issues that have been raised over the past 8 or so years are red herrings, nurtured by one party. Funny how since that party won the election, complaints about rigged elections evaporated. The amount of \$ that has been spent on this nonsense is shameful. I think MMA should stay out of the fight. I'd rather see political parties banned from participating in elections altogether.
- This is a political issue that we should stay out of.
- I would suggest no action on these, especially when confusion and cost is involved.

[LD 313](#) *An Act to Improve Voter Confidence in Electronic Ballot Counting by Requiring Ballots to Contain Unique Identifiers* (Sponsored by Rep. Foster of Dexter)

Support

- **Enhances Transparency:** By requiring ballots to have unique identifiers, this bill ensures that the election process is more transparent. The public can access a list of votes cast, organized by these identifiers, promoting greater openness and reducing suspicions about election integrity. **Boosts Voter Confidence:** Knowing that ballots are uniquely identified and that votes are recorded and publicly accessible can help increase voter confidence in the accuracy and fairness of electronic voting systems. **Improves Accountability:** The requirement for the unique identifier allows for better tracking of ballots, making it easier to identify and address any discrepancies or irregularities in the voting process. **Supports Auditability:** With unique identifiers tied to each ballot, election results can be more easily verified and audited, ensuring that any potential issues can be swiftly identified and addressed. **Reduces Fraud Risk:** The use of unique identifiers could minimize the risk of election fraud, as each ballot would be clearly traceable, preventing unauthorized alterations or duplication. **Strengthens Trust in Electronic Voting:** As electronic voting systems become more prevalent, this bill ensures that voters and election officials alike can trust that the system is accurate, secure, and accountable. Overall, this bill strengthens election security and transparency, promoting greater public trust in the electoral process.

Oppose

- The whole point of having a secret ballot and vote is that the voter is not identified in any way. The ballots are already coded and tested to make sure the votes are tabulated correctly; this is extra that is not needed. I am sure this will also cost extra when printing ballots and coding the equipment. The Tabulator prints a list of all the candidates and votes once voting is complete at 8 pm. Our town already posts that information to our website and Facebook before we leave for the night.
- This bill is unnecessary and more work for Town Clerks. Clerks are already required to submit a list of total votes cast. Not sure why you would need to list every unique identifier for every ballot cast. Redundancy.
- I would argue that MMA should oppose that bill. Besides the vague reference to a "unique identifier" (what IS that?), this seems another effort to complicate an election process that Maine runs very well. One more technicality, presumably controlled by the State (through SOS), will promote the possibility that the State can find some reason to NOT COUNT selected ballots cast.
- I would like MMA to oppose all three of these bills that could create unnecessary action that is likely not in keeping with the will of the majority of Maine's voters. I have not researched it, but strongly suspect that the Secretary of State's office does not support these bills.
- An additional layer of unfunded burden and cost on local governments for little payback.

- More expense, more complexity, more chance for something to go wrong. More money wasted on red herrings.
- Clerks don't need to manage this. Confident in process as is.
- Tracking ballots does NOT enhance voter confidence but just the opposite – it leads to suspicion of big brother looking back to see how individuals voted.
- While it would be nice to have a deadline, it would cause more headaches than benefits. When voters move right before an election, the same day registration gives them the chance to register and vote in the municipality/district they should be. Setting a deadline would disenfranchise the voters and it is all about connivence for the voters.
- I'm not really sure where this bill is coming from. I feel it is unnecessary and implies impropriety in our current system. We, as clerks, already report out our results on election night as soon as they are available. I guess I'm not sure what is to gain from this.

NFNA

- This is another political issue. It would add an additional programming cost to the ballots. Ballots are currently not supposed to have anything on them that would identify the voter, by adding a unique identifier to only the municipalities who process ballots with a tabulator, you are now potentially identifying an individual voter and only doing it for the part of the voting population. Someone coming to the polls on election day may not remember what their unique identifier is then cause a scene when poll workers are unable to give it to them.

No Position

- I would suggest no action on these, especially when confusion and cost is involved.

Track

- My inclination on 313 is to track, but I'm sitting in the opposed camp. I don't think that posting on the website is necessary (and there are municipalities that don't have websites). Municipal clerks run elections-- I don't think we want to be in the habit of taking a position against something that may be painted as enhancing election integrity (whether or not we agree with that perspective). With that said, I think there are enough holes in this legislation to oppose. If we aren't tying the unique identifiers to voters, then where is the added accountability. If you are tying the unique identifiers to voters, then we are eroding the concept of secret ballot elections and the right to freely cast a ballot without fear of repercussion.

LD 349 *An Act to Repeal the Laws That Allow Same-day Voter Registration* (Sponsored by rep. Bagshaw of Windham)

Support

- I would support this as it creates more work for ballot clerks who are not necessarily trained to register voters and also could create delays in moving voting lines along.
- As a former Town Clerk, I would support this bill. The close of business on Thursday before election day is already the deadline to vote absentee ballot without a special circumstance. If LD 349 passes, it will alleviate clerks from printing their incoming voter lists at the last minute to process and include all the new voter registration cards that come in the day before election day. Otherwise, the way the law is now, citizens can register up to the close of business the night before the election. If a clerk has already printed the incoming voter list, they will need to input all the new voter registration cards and then print addendum sheets to be inserted under each letter of the alphabet in the incoming voter list for the poll workers the next morning at check-in. I am sure it is a major pain for those larger municipalities with multiple voting polls. Election day is long enough and any way to lessen the duration the night before for the clerks is a benefit.
- Removes an unnecessary burden on community/local government state. It is not their fault that individuals don't care enough to be prepared to exercise their right.

Oppose

- VOTERS SHOULD HAVE EVERY AVAILABLE CHANCE TO VOTE! If residents have the required proof of residency and ID they should be allowed to register and vote on election day. Repealing election day voter registration would disenfranchise so many residents. Election day staff would also take the brunt of the complaints and hostility.
- If you make it hard enough to vote, people will opt out.
- While the idea of same-day registration initially appeared as a significant burden, I don't think it is excessive. Look at the number of new voters coming in during the 11/24 election. People are busy; we want voter participation/civic involvement. Preventing same-day registration creates an unnecessary obstacle. If you want to strengthen voter list integrity, there are better ways to do it. Honestly, I'd say "pick a horse and ride it." Do you want voter ID, eliminate same-day registration, ballot tracking, or what? Pick one. I get that people can be skeptical of the voter registration system, but attacking the core of the system isn't appropriate. As much as I feel a Clerk's office needs to sit on the sideline, something like eliminating same-day voter registration gives the *perception* to the public that we are limiting voter access- and that isn't something to settle for.
- Similarly, MMA should oppose LD349. Barring evidence of voter fraud, of which there is almost zero, this is another attempt to make voting more difficult to people who have

distances to travel, are without transportation (to come to the town office twice to vote once), or have other limiting factors or disabilities. There is a national movement through ALEC and other partisan lobbying groups to pretend to solve a problem that does not exist and certainly not in Maine. The motives behind this "reform" are not honorable. Our voting system is not broken but the "big lie" serves the purposes of those who would break it in order to serve their interests.

- I would like MMA to oppose all three of these bills that could create unnecessary action that is likely not in keeping with the will of the majority of Maine's voters. I have not researched it, but strongly suspect that the Secretary of State's office does not support these bills.
- Because of Maine Maritime Academy (the other MMA), we sometimes have as many as 200 new voter registrations on a Presidential Election Day. However, our office does not see this as an issue and is happy to be able to give students the ability to cast their vote.
- Laws should encourage voting. I work the polls at every election. People have registered on the same day at each of those elections. No problems have ever been encountered.
- Bath had more than 500 voter registration updates on Election Day. Process is fine.
- I believe our election day registration is a great service to our voters. I know it causes us some extra work but we have been doing it for so long that it is imbedded in our current process. Also, with the implementation of the Automatic Voter Registration and Online Voter Registration systems I found that I didn't have as many election day registrations last election as I expected. I believe as the AVR and OVR become more known to voters and if we publicize them well it will curb the amount of election day registrations to mostly those who really need it because there was a very recent change close the election day.

NFNA

- For: Improved Election Integrity: Reduces last-minute eligibility issues and ensures only eligible voters participate. Streamlined Administration: Eases the administrative burden on election officials by removing same-day registration. Reduced Fraud Risk: Prior registration helps ensure proper verification of voter eligibility. Encourages Early Planning: Sets a clear registration deadline to allow time to address any issues before election day. Against: Voter Disenfranchisement: Could prevent eligible voters from casting their ballots, particularly those who miss the registration deadline or register late. Reduced Accessibility: Makes it harder for people with busy schedules or life changes to register, limiting their ability to vote. Lower Voter Turnout: Same-day registration has been linked to higher turnout, and eliminating it could decrease participation. Election Day Burden: While removing same-day registration may reduce complications, it could shift the burden to early or absentee voting, where similar issues might arise.

- Repealing same day voter registration will stir the activists into a frenzy that municipalities are making it difficult for citizens to exercise their right to vote. I do believe, however, that there should be safeguards in place to prevent anyone from registering in multiple locations on the same day as election day. For instance, if a person comes into the town office to register to vote on a non-election day, there is time to enter their information into the statewide voter registration system and identify if they are already registered somewhere else. On election day, that is not always possible. Maybe the new voter should receive an absentee ballot and envelope on which they have to state their name. Once the clerk has a chance to enter their registration into the statewide system to confirm they are not registered elsewhere, their ballot can be counted.

No Position

- I would suggest no action on these, especially when confusion and cost is involved.