#3 PC

Good morning.

This Commissioners Court is again asked to reconsider its delegation of day-to-day supervisory authority over the County Elections Department to a single member of this Court.

Some statutory framework was addressed in my previous public comment and will not be repeated today. A copy is attached.

The issue is simple. The County Judge is currently a candidate for County Judge, and the Elections Department is responsible for administering that election.

Currently, the County Judge exercises "supervision and assignment of functional responsibilities" over the Elections Department under a delegation he requested from this Court in May 2025, before his campaign treasurer paperwork was filed. The adopted May 2025 organization chart shows the Elections Department as a direct report to the County Judge. A direct report is not merely quarterly oversight.

This is a governance question for the Court: whether an individual member should have continuing, day-to-day supervisory authority over the Elections Department at all—particularly when that individual is a candidate in an election being administered by that department.

The request is that the Court consider returning that authority to the statutory roles and oversight structure: the Elections Administrator performing the department's responsibilities, with oversight and actions by the Election Commission and Commissioners Court as provided by law.

There is also one specific records question concerning the March 3 primary.

Attached is a signed Form 10-6 reporting 8,021 early-voting ballots cast. The records reviewed for this comment show 7,484 combined-party in-person early voting. That is a difference of 537 early-voting ballots cast.

This is not a request that the Court assume what caused that difference. It is a request for the reconciliation.

How does the County reconcile the signed Form 10-6 showing 8,021 early-voting ballots with check-in records showing only 7,484?

Thank you.

Good afternoon,

Today I ask the Commissioners Court to reconsider its previous delegation of authority over the County Elections Department to a single individual.

My concern is the legal source of that delegation and whether its structure provides appropriate separation between a candidate and the office administering that candidate's election.

Here are the relevant facts-

The County Judge is on the November ballot as a candidate for County Judge.

The County Judge chairs the County Election Commission. Under Texas Election Code Section 31.032, the Commission appoints the County Elections Administrator. Section 31.036 makes the Commission the proper authority to receive and act on the Administrator's resignation. Under Section 31.037, suspension or termination requires a four-fifths vote of the Commission and approval by a majority of the Commissioners Court. Section 31.039 assigns the Commissioners Court responsibility for Elections Office staffing levels and for providing office space, equipment, and operating expenses.

These statutes assign significant functions concerning the Elections Administrator and the Elections Department, to the Election Commission, and to the Commissioners Court *acting as a body*.

Currently, the County Judge exercises "supervision and assignment of functional responsibilities" over the Elections Department under a delegation he requested from this Court in May 2025, before his campaign treasurer paperwork was filed. The adopted May 2025 organization chart shows the Elections Department as a direct report to the County Judge.

I am not alleging misconduct or bad faith. I am asking this Court to examine whether this type of individual supervision is appropriate as a matter of county governance.

Texas law reflects a strong policy of separating election administration from political candidacy and partisan activity. Texas law also recognizes the importance of independent and disinterested judgment when governmental responsibilities overlap.

The concern is not about one candidate or one election. It is about whether

the County should have a consistent governance policy that avoids placing any individual member of the Commissioners Court in a position of day-to-day supervisory authority over the Elections Department while that individual is a candidate in an election administered by that office.

I ask this Commissioners Court to reconsider whether day-to-day supervisory authority over the Elections Department needs to be delegated to any individual member of the Commissioners Court at all, or whether the Elections Administrator should instead carry out the department's statutory responsibilities subject to the oversight and actions of the Election Commission and the Commissioners Court as provided by law.

Thank you for your time,

Patty

Public Comment — Burnet County Commissioners Court
Monday, August 17, 2026
General Public Comments from Patty Cope, Voter

I want to bring two things to your attention about the March third Republican Primary — both from Burnet County's own election records.

The 1st issue is a number: **537.**

Form 10-6, the Ballot Transmittal Form signed by the Elections Administrator, reports **8,021** in-person early voting ballots cast.

Four independent contemporaneous records — the tabulation machines, the pollbook, the March 4th Cumulative Results Report, and the March 5th Results by Category — all show **7,484** voters checked in.

Every voter who checks in gets a ballot. Every ballot cast came from a voter who checked in. Ballots cast and voters checked in should closely equal each other.

They don't. 8,021 ballots claimed, minus 7,484 voters checked in, equals **537** ballots on a signed official form with no voter check-ins behind them.

Either the Form 10-6 is wrong, and a signed official form overstates ballots cast by **537**. Or the check-in records are wrong, and **537** voters cast ballots without ever being checked in. Voters deserve an answer.

The 2nd issue is also a number: **641.**

The county mailed **641** absentee ballots to voters across both parties for the March 2026 primary — 408 Republican, 233 Democratic.

Chapter 87 of the Texas Election Code requires notice of when the Early Voting Ballot Board convenes, and accept-reject records for each mail ballot. Chapter 66 requires chain-of-custody records. These are not optional. The statute requires them.

Through the Texas Public Information Act, the county responded that no such records exist. For **641** mail ballots.

I am not accusing anyone of misconduct. I am asking questions the records themselves raise.

This Commissioners Court has spoken publicly in support of election integrity. Election integrity begins with reconciled records for elections we've already held. My questions are about the March 3, 2026 primary — the election behind us, upon which the November election is built:

1. How does the county reconcile a signed official form that overstates ballots cast by **537** compared to voters who actually checked in?
2. Where are the statutory records for the **641** absentee mail ballots?
3. What action will this Court take to require the elections office to produce reconciled records and account for the missing ones — for the March 3, 2026 Republican Primary?

4. Did the county breach its contracts with the parties to diligently administer the election in compliance with all applicable statutes?

Please let me know.

This Commissioners Court has oversight over elections administration.

Thank you for your interest in election integrity.

Patty

Encl: Form 10-6 (undated)

10-6
Prescribed by Secretary of State
Section 87.021 and 87.1221, Texas Election Code
9/2023

BALLOT TRANSMITTAL FORM FOR EARLY VOTED BALLOTS

03/03/2026 — Date of Election

Primary — Type of Election

1. Number of ballots voted by personal appearance and delivered to the early voting Ballot board judge (same number as the number of voters on the poll list for early Voting in person): 8021

2. Number of ballots voted by mail or mail procedure and delivered to the early voting Ballot board judge: 561

3. Total number of early voted ballots delivered to the early voting ballot board judge (add lines 1 and 2): 8582

Signature of Early Voting Clerk

---

4. Number of ballots voted by mail and accepted by board: 561

5. Total number of early ballots counted by the early voting ballot board or delivered to the central counting station for automatic tabulation (add lines 1 and 4): 8582

6. Number of mail ballots rejected by board: 0

The information provided by the early voting clerk in lines 1 and 2 is true and correct.

Signature of Early Voting Ballot Board Judge

INSTRUCTIONS

The early voting clerk completes the first half of the form prior to delivering the early voting materials to the early voting ballot board judge. The judge completes the remainder of the form after the ballots have been qualified. The form is returned to the custodian of election records with other early voting records.

Line 4 + line 6 = line 2.

Line 3 – line 6 = line 5. If ballots are counted automatically at the central counting station, the number of ballots recorded on the ballot and seal certificate is the same as line 5.

10-6
Prescribed by Secretary of State
Section 87.021 and 87.1221, Texas Election Code
9/2023

BALLOT TRANSMITTAL FORM FOR EARLY VOTED BALLOTS

03/03/2026 — Date of Election

Primary — Type of Election

1. Number of ballots voted by personal appearance and delivered to the early voting Ballot board judge (same number as the number of voters on the poll list for early Voting in person): 8021

2. Number of ballots voted by mail or mail procedure and delivered to the early voting Ballot board judge: 561

3. Total number of early voted ballots delivered to the early voting ballot board judge (add lines 1 and 2): 8582

Signature of Early Voting Clerk

---

4. Number of ballots voted by mail and accepted by board: 561

5. Total number of early ballots counted by the early voting ballot board or delivered to the central counting station for automatic tabulation (add lines 1 and 4): 8582

6. Number of mail ballots rejected by board: 0

The information provided by the early voting clerk in lines 1 and 2 is true and correct.

Signature of Early Voting Ballot Board Judge

INSTRUCTIONS

The early voting clerk completes the first half of the form prior to delivering the early voting materials to the early voting ballot board judge. The judge completes the remainder of the form after the ballots have been qualified. The form is returned to the custodian of election records with other early voting records.

Line 4 + line 6 = line 2.

Line 3 – line 6 = line 5. If ballots are counted automatically at the central counting station, the number of ballots recorded on the ballot and seal certificate is the same as line 5.