CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF CLERKS AND ELECTION OFFICIALS

Legislative Committee Meeting

Minutes – February 28, 2014

Sacramento, California

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attendees: | County | Attendees: | County |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stephanie Mizuno | CCAC Leg Committee | Rebecca Spencer | Riverside |
| Scott Konopasek | Contra Costa | Jill LaVine | Sacramento |
| Geoff Neill | CSAC | Cynthia Paes | San Diego |
| Kammi Foote | Inyo | Michael Vu | San Diego |
| Karen Rhea | Kern | Joe Holland | Santa Barbara |
| Dean Logan | Los Angeles | Philip Chantri | Santa Clara |
| Rebecca Martinez | Madera | Tricia Webber | Santa Cruz |
| Elaine Ginnold | Marin | John Gardner | Solano |
| Colleen Ksanda | Marin | Gloria Colter | Sonoma |
| Gregory Diaz | Nevada | Bart Broome | SOS |
| Sandra Sjoberg | Nevada | Jana Lean | SOS |
| Elise Strickler | Nevada | Susan McEntire | Speaker’s Office |
| Neal Kelley | Orange | Barry Brokaw |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Jill LaVine convened the meeting at 9 a.m. Introductions were made.

**Minutes from January 24, 2014**

Motion by Dean Logan to approve January 24, 2014 minutes with amendments to attendance list. Tricia Webber seconds motion. Motion carried.

# Correspondence Secretary

Ms. LaVine again thanked Scott Konopasek for agreeing to take on the role of writing correspondence related to the Election Legislative Committee’s actions/interests/concerns. These letters typically represent the committee’s positions on bills that are going through the legislative process and are sent to Members of the Legislature, Legislative Committees, and the Governor. Ms. LaVine thanked Michael Vu who had agreed to temporarily take on the role of Correspondence Secretary last year.

# Barry Brokaw and Jill LaVine: 2014 CACEO Bill Proposal Updates

Mr. Brokaw briefly summarized the success of finding authors for a number of CACEO proposals. A number of the proposals have committee chairs as authors.

# *Legislation*

AB 1589 (Frazier) Military or overseas voters: electronic ballots

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would allow an application - by military/overseas voters – for electronic delivery of a ballot to be a standing request. Current law considers the request valid only through December 31 of the year following the calendar year of the date of the application or another shorter period the voter specifies. There are technical and legal concerns related to this bill. Michael Vu is working with Secretary of State staff to attempt to resolve these concerns. CACEO – in general – supports the “standing request” concept, i.e., deleting the December 31 expiration provision.

AB 1596 (Garcia) Elections: vote by mail ballot applications

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would require that printed and completed vote by mail applications – that are submitted by mail - only be mailed to an elections official’s addresses. (Current law allows for postal delivery of completed applications to third parties.) The proposal explicitly states that nothing would prevent third party organizations from collecting/receiving applications from voters by means other than mailing to those applications directly to them.

Attendees commented that the bill doesn’t prohibit campaigns from circulating applications while strengthening the ability for election offices to receive applications in a timelier manner.

Motion to support by Dean Logan. Elaine Ginnold seconds motion. Motion carries.

Mr. Konospasek will submit letter of support to author.

AB 1752 (Fong) Redistricting: incumbent designation

Position: No Position

Discussion: This bill affects the Secretary of State ballot designation process, i.e., who may claim the title of incumbent after redistricting.

No position.

AB 1768 (Fong) Declaration of candidacy: residence address

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would allow confidential voters – who are candidates for office - to omit their residential address on the Declaration of Candidacy. This bill is based on CACEO proposal 14-01. John Gardner – who chairs the Votecal Business Process committee for CACEO – explored the possibility of using this bill as a vehicle to address confidential voter issues that have arisen in relation to VoteCal implementation. (For example: eliminating Board of Supervisor approval for confidential peace officer registration; eliminating the two year expiration of confidential registration; not listing confidential records on voter lists that are purchased; and court ordered confidential voters retaining that status when re-registering in a new county.) Attendees discussed a number of issues related to confidential voters and VoteCal implementation. It was decided that those very important issues should be addressed through another vehicle. Additionally, SOS staff will look at the issues and attempt to address them through clean up legislation.

Motion to support by Tricia Webber. Greg Diaz seconds motion. Motion carries.

AB 1817 (Gomez) Voter registration: deputy registrars of voters: high school students

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would permit the governing board of a school district to authorize a high school pupil 16 years of age or older to become a deputy registrar of voters and to registrar to vote qualified pupils on his or her high school campus.

Attendees generally were in favor of the idea behind the bill but had the following feedback:

* How could we ensure that the registration activities only occurred on campus?
* It appears that there is nothing in current law that does not allow high school students to act as deputy registrars; would the bill’s language prohibit those under 16 from acting as deputy registrars; perhaps this would allow the school board to narrow activity as they see appropriate.
* This may help better track the location of voter registration forms by specifically attributing to specific locations.

Dean Logan will speak to the author regarding intent of the bill and the possibility of amending such that high school students can register off campus.

AB 1836 (Jones) Vote by mail ballots

Position: Oppose

Discussion: This bill would require the elections official to provide each polling place with a blank roster for recording specified information from persons returning a vote by mail ballot, including the name and residence address of the person authorized by the voter to return the voter’s vote by mail ballot. This bill would also require that the identification envelope contain the address of the person authorized by the voter to return the vote by mail ballot.

Attendees had a number of concerns/comments about the bill:

* There is no provision to address unsigned envelopes delivered by a third party. Response by SOS staff was that technically we should not accept these ballots based on the Election Code. (The basis of the code seems to lie in chain of custody concerns.)
* Passage of the bill would be costly to counties related to a new roster and return envelope.
* The bill may raise concerns related to vote suppression as it goes legislative process.

Motion to oppose by Elaine Ginnold. Gloria Colter seconds motion. Motion carries.

Mr. Konopasek will send an “oppose” letter to the author based on the discussion.

AB 1873 (Gonzalez) Mail ballot elections

Position: Watch

This bill would:

* Authorize a board of supervisors of a county to conduct a special election or special consolidated election to fill a congressional or legislative vacancy wholly by mail under specified conditions.
* Remove the requirement that an all-mail ballot election be conducted only in a city with a population of 100,000 or less.
* Delete the provision prohibiting a consolidated election from being conducted wholly by mail, and would instead provide that in order to conduct an all-mail ballot election in a consolidated election in which boundaries overlap, all jurisdictions of the overlapping boundaries would be required to agree to conduct the election as an all-mail ballot election.
* Authorize a municipal election, as specified, to be conducted as an all-mail ballot election.

This bill is being sponsored by San Diego County. (Michael Vu gave general background including that the bill allows special vacancy – among others – to be conducted primarily by vote by mail where postage is paid and where there are drop off locations starting 21 days before an election.) He indicated that there was still an ability to amend the bill per concerns.

Discussion: Attendees had a number of concerns/comments about the bill:

* Establishing drop off locations at 21 days may be too early. (Perhaps it could be “at least five days”.
* Finding drop off locations in some unincorporated areas may be very challenging.
* Would UDEL elections fall under this proposal?
* Would this limit cities abilities to have vote by mail elections when special districts were having simultaneous elections? (Perhaps 4004 (d) could be eliminated to address this.)
* The Secretary of State has concerns about the bill around security and access of drop off locations.
* Voters may be confused by having postage paid in one election and not in another.

We will continue to watch the bill.

AB 2003 (Fong) Ballot materials: translations

Position: No Position

Discussion: This bill would address challenges with obtaining appropriate translators for election materials. It is in response to CACEO Proposal 14-02 which was proposed by John Tuteur of Napa County. Mr. Tuteur would like to delay the bill since it only addresses Spanish translations. Mr. Vu will work with Mr. Tuteur on amendment proposals.

AB 2028 (Mullin) All-mailed ballot elections: counties

Position: Support if amended

Discussion:This bill would authorize a special election to be conducted in a county, including a charter county or charter city and county, wholly by mail, if specified conditions are satisfied. It is an expansion of the Yolo County “pilot” for vote by mail elections that is currently provided for in the Elections Code 4001.

Gloria Colter indicated that this bill is sponsored by Sonoma County.

Discussion: Attendees had a number of concerns/comments about the bill:

* The bill goes beyond the Yolo pilot by including a “vote center” concept.
* It appears that the Yolo project would not be affected by this bill.
* Section 8 of the bill seems to imply that reconciliation processes affiliated with current voting technology would need to be undertaken according to conditions on voting systems.
* It appears that the current language could be interpreted to imply that the polling place/drop off location would only be on Election Day.
* 28 days seems too long for the ballot drop off location period.
* Mandating that drop boxes be “inside” seems too restrictive.
* The SOS may be reluctant to broaden this type of program beyond the Yolo provisions.

Motion to support if amended such that 28 day period for drop locations be “no less than seven days” and drop off box be “at a building” rather than “inside” by Elaine Ginnold. Gloria Colter seconds motion. Motion carries.

Mr. Konopasek will send a “support if amended” letter to the author based on the discussion.

AB 2177 (Brown) Early voting

Position: Letter of Concern

Discussion: This bill would require the Secretary of State to provide guidance to local elections officials in performing specified tasks for the purpose of promoting and expanding the practice of early voting, as defined, consistent with specified statutory authority. The bill would define “early voting” to mean voting a vote by mail ballot in person at the office of the elections official or another location designated by the elections official either before or on the day of the election.

The bill would require an elections official, on at least one Saturday on or after the date the elections official first delivers ballots to vote by mail voters for a statewide election, or for any other election as determined by the elections official based on voter demand, to allow voters to vote in the election by means of early voting at the early voting location designated for this purpose, provided that the location is accessible and complies with disability access requirements under federal and state law. The bill would permit the elections official to determine the hours of operation for the designated early voting location or locations for each Saturday on which early voting is offered, provided that each location shall be open to voters for a minimum of 4 hours on each designated Saturday. These provisions regarding Saturday voting would not apply to elections conducted wholly by mail or to precincts in which each voter is furnished with a vote by mail ballot, as specified. The bill has urgency provisions.

Discussion: Attendees had a number of concerns/comments about the bill including:

* It too strictly defines early voting ballots as a vote by mail ballot voted at an elections office; the future may require a less restrictive definition.
* Why do we need a bill that provides for what a number of election officials already do?
* This would be costly for counties who do not do Saturday voting if no reimbursement.

Motion to send letter of concerns related to strict definition of early voting as vote by mail and costs by Dean Logan. Neal Kelley seconds motion. Motion carries.

Mr. Konopasek will send a “letter of concern” to the author based on the discussion.

AB 2219 (Fong) Initiative and referendum: petitions: verification of signatures

Position: Support if amended

Discussion: This bill would require:

* The elections official or registrar of voters during the examination of statewide initiative/referendum signatures to submit one or more reports to the Secretary of State showing the number of signatures that have been verified as of that date.
* The Secretary of State to maintain a list indicating the number of verified signatures based on the most recent reports and, if the Secretary of State determines that based on the list the petition is signed by the requisite number of voters, a require the Secretary of State to notify the elections official or registrar of every county or city and county of that fact.
* After receipt of the notification that the petition has obtained the requisite number of verified signatures, the elections official or registrar of voters to immediately transmit to the Secretary of State the petition and an amended certificate showing the results of the examination and would permit the elections official or registrar to suspend the signature verification until the Secretary of State transmits a certificate to terminate the verification or provides other instructions.

Also, existing law prescribes the procedure for determining the total number of valid signatures affixed to a county initiative petition and requires the county elections official, if the initiative petition contains more than 500 signatures, to verify signatures using a random sampling method. If the sampling shows the petition contains 95 to 110% of the number of valid signatures to qualify the petition, the county elections official is required to verify each signature filed. This bill would permit the elections official to terminate the verification of the remaining unverified signatures if he or she determines, prior to completing the examination of each signature filed, that the petition is signature by the requisite number of qualified voters to declare the petition sufficient.

Attendees generally were in favor of the bill but had concerns/comments about the bill including:

* That some counties may wait to start checking petitions to see if the threshold is met by larger counties; perhaps there could be an obligatory and documented start date to avoid this.
* Would the bill limit the ability to manage their petition work load since counties are frequently processing local petitions at the same time they are processing state petitions?

Mr. Brokaw indicated that it would be productive to provide our comments/concerns to the author since this is a bill that is seeking to assist counties.

Motion to support if amended by Dean Logan. Philip Chantri seconds motion. Motion carries.

Mr. Konopasek will send a “support if amended” letter to the author based on the discussion.

AB 2243 (Weber) Elections: voting rights guide: incarcerated persons

Position: Watch

Discussion:This bill would require the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to either establish and maintain on the department’s Internet Web site a hyperlink to the Internet Web site at which the Secretary of State’s voting rights guide for incarcerated persons may be found or post in each parole office a notice that contains the Internet Web site address at which the voting rights guide may be found.

This bill does not affect county election operations.

AB 2273 (Ridley-Thomas) Payment of election expenses

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would provide that expenses authorized and necessarily incurred on or after January 1, 2013, and for each year thereafter, for elections proclaimed by the Governor to fill a vacancy in the office of Senator or Member of the Assembly, or to fill a vacancy in the office of United States Senator or Member of the United States House of Representatives, shall be paid by the state. The bill would require the state to pay only those additional expenses directly related to an election proclaimed by the Governor to a fill a vacancy in an office if the election is consolidated with a statewide or local election.

Attendees are in favor of the bill. CACEO will need cost information for hearings going forward. Ms. Rhea has a mechanism (spreadsheet) to gather costs that she will circulate to counties.

Motion to support by Dean Logan. Greg Diaz seconds motion. Motion carries.

Mr. Konopasek will send a letter of support to the author based on the discussion.

AB 2351 (Gordon) Political party qualification

Position: Watch

Discussion: No discussion.

AB 2369 (Morrell) Elections: expenses

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would allow candidate controlled campaign committees pay for an election recount. This bill does not limit those parties who can currently request a recount. Its intent appears to make campaign expenditure reporting more straightforward when committees write checks for recount activities.

AB 2407 (Morrell) Elections: expenses

Position: No position

Discussion: Existing law provides that expenses authorized and necessarily incurred in the preparation for and conduct of elections are to be paid from the county treasuries, except as specified.This bill would make technical nonsubstantive changes to this provision of law.

This is a spot bill.

AB 2530 (Wagner) Ballot processing

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would provide that if a vote by mail ballot, mail ballot precinct ballot, or provisional ballot is processed using signature verification technology that determines the signatures do not compare, the elections official is required to visually examine and verify that the signatures do not compare before rejecting the ballot.

This bill is sponsored by the Secretary of State.

Attendees had a number of concerns/comments about the bill:

* The Secretary of State has concerns that rejected ballots may not be checked by humans.
* Counties who use this technology already check rejected ballots; why is the bill necessary?
* The intent of this bill may give voters more confidence in technology.

AB 2562 (Fong) Elections: ballots

Position: Watch

Discussion: Existing law regulates generally the issuing of ballots on election day as well as the use of direct recording electronic voting systems. Existing law defines the terms “direct recording electronic voting system” and “paper record copy” for purposes of these provisions. This bill would correct erroneous cross references to the code section that defines those terms.

This is an omnibus bill that may have additions including those related to on-line voter registration.

AB 2631 (Dababneh) Elections: voting machines

Position: None

Discussion:This bill would modify and update the definition of “voting machine” to mean any electronic device into which a voter may enter his or her votes, and which, by means of electronic tabulation and generation of specified printouts and records, furnishes a total of the number of votes cast for each candidate or measure. The bill would make conforming changes and repeal obsolete provisions of existing law. It would also modify and repeal certain precinct board requirements and procedures relating to the reading, posting, and inspection of the statement of return of votes cast for the precinct.

This bill is sponsored by the Secretary of State.

Attendees had a number of concerns/comments about the bill:

* Why does this bill require three copies of results when the current certification process requires two?
* Why does the bill address overvotes and undervotes?
* Some provisions of this bill may potentially be in conflict with the implementation of SB 360. Why not wait until the implementation of SB 360 is more clear to introduce a bill like this?
* Why is the bill just “clean up” and not more reflective of current certification practices?
* The bill refers to permanent records when certain records can be destroyed within 22 months.
* Why was there no dialog by the SOS with county election officials before the bill went into print? Would the SOS be willing to hold off on moving the bill until there is more dialog.

SB 240 (Yee) Vote by mail ballot drop boxes

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would permit a vote by mail voter to return his or her voted vote by mail ballot to the elections official from whom it came at a vote by mail ballot drop-off location, as defined. This bill would require the Secretary of State to promulgate regulations establishing security measures and procedures that a county elections official would be required to comply with if the county elections official establishes one or more vote by mail ballot drop-off locations and vote by mail ballot drop boxes, as defined.

Many of the details of the bill appear to be referred to the Secretary of State for clarification in regulations.

The Secretary of State has a number of concerns about the bill related to ballot security and will not support the bill. Among the concerns are that:

* The drop box be staffed appropriately
* The boxes may not be sealed and locked appropriately.
* The boxes may not be emptied daily
* The boxes may be subject to fraudulent activity.

We will invite Senator Yee’s staff back for further discussion of the bill.

SB 942 (Vidak) Special elections

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would provide that expenses authorized and necessarily incurred on or after January 1, 2008, and before December 31, 2014, for elections proclaimed by the Governor to fill a vacancy in the office of Senator or Member of the Assembly, or to fill a vacancy in the office of United States Senator or Member of the United States House of Representatives, shall be paid by the state. This bill has urgency provisions.

CSAC supports this bill.

Motion to support by Dean Logan. Greg Diaz seconds motion. Motion carries.

Mr. Konopasek will send a letter of support to the author based on the discussion.

SB 963 (Torres) Elections: payment of expenses

Position: Support

This bill would provide that expenses authorized and necessarily incurred on or after January 1, 2013, and for each year thereafter, for elections proclaimed by the Governor to fill a vacancy in the office of Senator or Member of the Assembly, or to fill a vacancy in the office of United States Senator or Member of the United States House of Representatives, shall be paid by the state. The bill would require the state to pay only those additional expenses directly related to an election proclaimed by the Governor to a fill a vacancy in an office if the election is consolidated with a statewide or local election.

Motion to support by Greg Diaz. Dean Logan seconds motion. Motion carries.

Mr. Konopasek will send a letter of support to the author based on the discussion.

SB 1043 (Torres) Elections: in-lieu-filing fee and political party qualification petitions: penal provisions Elections: in-lieu-filing fee and political party qualification petitions: penal provisions

Position: Support

Discussion:This bill would define the term “political party qualification petition” to mean a petition circulated to qualify a political party in accordance with existing procedures. It would also provide penalties for those committing fraud in relation to circulating petitions to qualify a political party or those circulating petitions for signatures in lieu of a filing fee.

This bill is sponsored by the Secretary of State.

Motion to support by Greg Diaz. Dean Logan seconds motion. Motion carries.

Mr. Konopasek will send a letter of support to the author based on the discussion.

SB 1061 (Block) Elections: voter registration

Position: None

Discussion: This bill – generally - would automatically register someone to vote when they perform specific transactions at the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Secretary of State staff met with the author who took a bill from 2008 and revamped it to achieve automatic registration when specific transactions are performed at the DMV or NVRA agencies. If the bill passes it will incur a large cost and is a general fund appropriation. All voters would be registered as NPP voters. Attendees felt that the bill deserves substantial consideration. Over time it would save money. DMV has citizenship data and this may assist with Conditional Voter Registration. Maybe HAVA funds can be used to help with the large upfront costs. Mr. Broome feels that there is room for discussion with the author. (There were some concerns raised about people being registered without intending to be registered if the process is too automated.)

Mr. Konopasek will send a letter of interest to the author based on the discussion. Mr. Logan will assist.

SB 1062 (Block) Elections: vote by mail ballots

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would require all vote by mail ballots be postage paid by counties.

CSAC supports this bill if the bill is amended to specifically provide for reimbursement for postage from the state and that reimbursement is – preferably – done up front. (Perhaps we could use a state postage account like we do with Voter Registration Cards.)

Attendees also discussed the following:

* Concerns about using Business Reply Mail (BRM); it delays mail since it is labor intensive for the post office; it adds one to two days for delivery time.
* There could be waste if postage was pre-paid and not used.
* A cost analysis is needed; Kammi Foote will assist with this.

Susan McEntire will send a study to Ms. LaVine conducted by San Mateo County regarding postage paid versus voter paid ballot return rates. Ms. LaVine and Michael Vu will speak to author’s office about funding this bill.

SB 1063 (Block) Voting rights guide: incarcerated persons

Position: None

Discussion: Existing law requires each county probation department to either establish and maintain on the county probation department’s Internet Web site a hyperlink to the Secretary of State’s voting rights guide for incarcerated persons or post a notice with the Internet Web site address that contains the Secretary of State’s voting rights guide for incarcerated persons in each probation office where probationers are seen. This bill would make a nonsubstantive change to this provision of law.

This is a spot bill.

SB 1105 (Liu) Voter registration: Cal Program application

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would require the standardized student financial aid application, if the application is submitted online, to permit the applicant to apply to register to vote online by submitting an affidavit of registration electronically on the Internet Web site of the Secretary of State.

Motion to support by Dean Logan. Scott Konopasek seconds motion. Motion carries.

Mr. Konopasek will send a letter of support to the author.

SB 1272 (Lieu) Elections: write-in candidates

Position: None

Discussion: Existing law provides procedures relating to the nomination of write-in candidates. Existing law requires that statement and nomination papers be available on the 57th day prior to the election for which a candidate is filing as a write-in candidate and requires that those papers be delivered to the elections official no later than the 14th day prior to the election.

This bill would make a nonsubstantive change to these provisions.

This is a spot bill.

SB 1309 (Steinberg) State vacancy

Position: None

Discussion:

Existing law authorizes the Governor to appoint a person to fill a vacancy occurring during the term of a member of the United States Senate from California. This bill would make a technical, nonsubstantive change to this provision.

This is a spot bill.

SB 1365 (Padilla) California Voting Rights Act of 2001

Position: Watch

Discussion:This bill would also prohibit the use of a district-based election in a political subdivision if it would impair the ability of a protected class, as defined, to elect candidates of its choice or otherwise influence the outcome of an election.

There are several lawsuits pending related to the subject of this bill.

SCA 16 (Steinberg) Members of the Legislature: vacancy

Position: None

Discussion:The California Constitution requires the Governor to call an election to fill a vacancy occurring in either house of the Legislature. This measure would instead require the Governor to fill a vacancy in either house of the Legislature by appointment within 21 days of the date of the vacancy, and would require that the appointee, at the time of the appointment and during the 12-month period immediately preceding the appointment, have the same political party preference as the vacating Member had when he or she was last elected to the Legislature. The measure would allow the house to which the appointment is made to reject the appointment, by a majority vote, within 21 days of the appointment, in which case the Governor would be required to make another appointment. If an appointment is not rejected, the appointee would be eligible to take office the day after the end of the 21-day period and would serve for the remainder of the term of the vacating Member, except as specified.

CACEO does not take positions on constitutional amendments. However, the author’s office would like the Association’s input and may come to a future meeting to seek feedback. (Mr. Logan may revisit the general policy of not taking positions on constitutional amendments with the CACEO Board of Directors.)

***Other Legislation*** *(All of these bills will be placed under a “watch” status.)*

Ms. Foote briefly discussed the following bills that may be of interest:

*SB 1442 (Lara) Political Reform Act of 1974*

*AB 1948 (Mullin) Counties: officers: qualification for office*

*SB 1101 (Padilla) Political Reform Act of 1974*

*SB 1102 (Padilla) Political Reform Act of 1974*

*SB 1103 (Padilla) Political Reform Act of 1974: candidacy for elective state office*

*SB 1104 (Padilla) Political Reform Act of 1974: campaign communication disclosure*

*SB 1337 (DeSaulnier) Public records electronic copies and media requests*

SB 1441 (Lara) Political Reform Act of 1974: gifts.

SB 1442 (Lara) Political Reform Act of 1974.

SB 1443 (Lara) Political Reform Act of 1974

SB 1444 (DeLeon) Fair Political Practices Commission: administration.

*U.S. Senate Bill 2017 - Boxer*

*Discussion: This bill addresses long lines that voters encounter when voting.*

***Conditional Voter Registration (CVR) Subcommittee***

Joe Holland, Chair of this subcommittee gave a summary of the meeting that took place yesterday.

The committee is currently working on compiling a list of Elections Code sections that will need to be changed and/or will become obsolete when CVR goes live. It is also looking at current processes to see if any would work with the proposed changes (roll playing so to speak). Donna Johnston will be working on flow charts to address different scenarios/use cases. The committee is also exploring legislative changes regarding satellite offices prior to Election Day and how COVR will affect the process.

***Business Process (BP) Subcommittee for VoteCal***

John Gardner, Chair of this subcommittee gave an overview of the BP Subcommittee meeting yesterday.

The committee heard a project status report from the VoteCal team. The project is still in the design phase and it appears that it is still on the time table outlined at earlier presentations. Mr. Gardner acknowledged the support that the committee has from both the Secretary of State staff and the VoteCal team. Confidential Voters is still a hot topic and the committee is proposing a design change request and/or legislative changes to address this category of voters. The committee is collecting data from the fit gap meetings with the election management system vendors so it can make a list of priorities that counties have and any related questions. VoteCal data standards were discussed and have been reviewed by the pilot counties and the BP subcommitee. They will be released to the counties at large soon for review.

The meeting was adjourned by Jill LaVine.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia Webber/ Tim McNamara

Thank you to Jill LaVine for her assistance in compiling this month’s minutes.