

Hartford County Minutes for June 11, 2019

Darlene Burrell called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m. Windsor Registrars were thanked for hosting the meeting and their willingness to host our next four meetings. New Registrars were introduced, Granby Sonya Smith, and her deputy, Sandy Lee. Also Patrice Peterson from West Hartford.

Secretary's Report by Laura Wolfe. Darlene just sent out two sets of minutes. September 2018 and January 2019. No corrections or additions, both were approved unanimously.

Treasurer's Report and Ways and Means Report by Sue Burnham. The spring conference was successful and all the money collect from Hartford County members was spent on the raffle basket. The revenue for the 50/50 was \$721. The revenue for the baskets was \$1,412 totaling \$2,133.

Q. Where does the revenue from Ways and Means go?

A. The money goes to the Judi Beaudreau scholarship fund. CT ROVs submit names of students who work elections, names are randomly drawn and scholarships are given. This year five names were drawn and \$250 per student was given to help with their college expenses.

Each year each county contributes a basket. Here in Hartford County we ask each town to contribute \$6 each to help cover the costs. South Windsor has been putting together our county basket and comes up with a theme, usually beer or wine.

Audit Committee by Lisbeth Becker. Nothing to report. The reports for last year were submitted. We track expenses on an interim basis and the final report is done just once per year. ROVAC deals with about \$150,000 per year, so an audit committee is needed. Peter Gostin, as treasurer, keeps all the receipts for the audit committee to look over. Lisbeth Becker will be the new ROVAC treasurer.

Convention Committee by Ann Clark and Sue Larson. We are going to be in Southbury on a Thursday and Friday, September 12 and 13, which is right after the primary. We have been discussing conference expectations at county meetings. One of the things that came up most towns are willing to pay more in return for less travel time. Hartford County rates are generally higher than the rest of the state, so we have been going elsewhere. But since Hartford County is the center of the state, how does everyone here feel about paying a little more, maybe \$5 per night more, for a central location? (Lots of hands went up,) By be willing to pay a little more, it opens up a wealth of new options, like meeting in Farmington. The other issue we discussed was the number of days. The suggestion was to make it a two day conference all the time, and figure out some way of scheduling the voting in. Hartford county has been pushing for this for a long time, but does everyone still agree with that? (Lots of hands went up.)

Q. Was there any discussion of keeping the conferences dates on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday - to avoid Friday rush hour.

A. Yes, that was the other thing that was discussed, everybody liked the Monday-Tuesday, but it is tough for Chris to put together because he would have to give up his whole weekend to get it set up. So we agreed in the middle of the week would be better.

The other topic that came up was the length of our conference days. A lot of Registrars have to give up a vacation day at their other job to attend our conferences, and they resent giving up a day for a conference that ends at 2 pm - they want fuller days that go to 4 or 5 pm.

Q. Longer days make sense for the Spring conference, since you are shrinking three days to two days. Can we get the Fall conference down to one day if it is a longer day?

A. (We will probably need to keep SOTS day separate.)

Q. Why do we always have to have the conferences in a hotel? Why can't we have the conference in a building that is close to a hotel? That would give us more options.

A. We would have issues with finding the catering that is provided by the hotels,

Q. Is anyone against having both the fall and spring conferences centrally located?

A. Hartford County 100% supports conferences being centrally located.

Q. SOTS Day seems like something that ROVAC cannot control at all, so what are the odds that they would give up half of their day to ROVAC classes to make it a full day?

A. Well they pretty much give up the second half of the day already, many of them leave early. So we could program something in after their classes. We could do something optional, like Moderator recertification or Citigroup is considering Certification classes.

Q. If Certification classes are offered, Citi would still charge \$200 per class for those?

A. (Yes.)

Our next conference dates for Spring 2020 are not booked yet. Chris Prue has focused on keeping our costs down, and we have gone back to Cromwell because of cheaper room rates.

Q. You mentioned offering the CITI Certification classes at a conference. Right now it is very difficult to find any available class for brand new Registrars. Could class 1 be potentially offered at a conference?

A. CITI has given a list of classes available from July to December, and it includes all eight sections. We plan to put on the ROVAC website. They have also agreed to combine sessions 1 and 2, to make it one full day. And 7 and 8 are also scheduled together. Hopefully they now have enough classes that this will work out okay. They are not going to be so quick to cancel classes, even if there are only 6 or 7, we asked that they do not cancel the class.

Q. Does something go out to all of the new Registrars explaining the certification process and who to contact to get in the classes? The new Registrar in Southington was asking, can you contact her?.

A. Sure

Q. How did the Moderator recertification class for Registrars go at the conference?

A. It was great, and Darlene is willing to do it again. It was such a success that all of the other moderator trainers are interested in doing it too.

Q. Will the Moderator Recertification classes still be offered to Registrars at no cost at the conferences?

A. Yes, but it is a recertification class, this is not for new Registrars. This class covers so much information, we have to skim through parts to cover everything, so there isn't time to allow many questions or go at a slow pace for new.

One more note, our signup sheet for this meeting has your information, please mark corrections so that we can get everyone on our email list. Windsor was not getting their emails, so we will need to check on that.

Q. Can we sign up deputies and assistants for the Moderator training at the conference?

A. No, it is strictly for Registrars who need to get recertified.

Q. I noticed that there were a few empty seats at your training - any chance extra seats could be opened to those whose certification is not expiring?

A. This was an experiment this year, we didn't know how it would go with such a large class. We decided to keep the number between 30 and 40. It seemed to go fine.

Q. We all as certified Registrars have to keep up our continuing education, 8 hours of training each year. Do we know from this last conference how many hours were accepted by the certification committee?

A. No, the Secretary of State approves education classes, and she has approved all of the ROVAC classes from that conference. It was about 6 hours.

Letters are going out to all of the Registrars who are not actively keeping their certification up to date. This was a shock to some people who did not expect any follow through. It is our understanding that Registrars are not supposed to allow their Moderator certification to lapse. For Moderators this is not an issue, so long as they recertify before working an Election. For Registrars there should not be a lapse - you need to maintain it.

Q. Are Deputies required to maintain their Moderator certification without any lapse?

A. No, Deputies are not, just Registrars. The statute just specifies Registrars.

Q. There are still issues with the new Clarity training program, that is required for Moderator Certification. Will the SOTS be addressing these errors?

A. Maybe. Be aware of the issues so that you can explain to any new people that there are some errors in this training. Some of the footage from the old program, like the cross-off of two names in a big straight line when checking in a voter is still there.

Credential Committee Report by Anita Mips: The conference went well. About 180 signed in as Registrars when we started, but there was concern that only about 70 were left in the room when we finished.

Education Committee Report by Sue Larson. They will start up again in July and August for the fall.

Q. So it will definitely be a two day conference and you will definitely offer Moderator recertification?

A. Yes, that is planned.

Q. Will the Registrar Certification classes be offered at the fall conference or is that further down the road?

A. CITI has a brand new director and she is trying to put everything together. SOTS will be sending out a survey from her, that will address what we want from this program.

Legislative Committee Report by Peter Gostin and Lisbeth Becker: The committee gave a lot of testimony back in February and March and a lot of work was done by Sue Larson and Tim DeCarlo and Ryan Bingham - our representative from Sullivan & LeShane. They spent inordinate amounts of time up at the Capital. It was good or bad, depending on how you look at things. Tim sent this out last week. "The 2019 Legislative session ended this morning at midnight, and although there were over 90 GAE bills (Government Administration and Elections) that were sent out of committee none passed in full." This is a situation where a lot of these bills could have been very detrimental to how we run elections, especially with reference to EDR. "Our Title 9 #6055 cleanup bill didn't pass the House and was scheduled for a vote late last Wednesday, but time ran out." So even though that was not beneficial for us because we have been trying to get a cleanup bill through for a couple of years, basically nothing passed.

Some of the EDR bills came out of committee and passed in the House, but the Senate just never brought them up. One of them would have EDR in all polling places, as an option - the original bill would have made it mandatory. Another bill would have allowed EDR past 8:00 pm, that passed the House and could have been very detrimental to our entire organization - trying to get our results in by midnight, especially in larger cities. But that did not pass. The primary bill to get all primaries, so in Municipal years going from September to August, that died. The bathroom bill that was submitted a few years ago by a legislator who was not allowed back in the polling place to use the bathroom was back. He wrote this bill but it violates the 75 foot rule, and another issue of non-electors going into a polling place, that was shot down. The pop up polls bill, that would have required towns to put polling places in any university or college did not pass. The one thing that did pass was potential move to early voting. They did not have enough votes to move it forward immediately as Constitutional amendment but they can bring it up again in two years where only a simple majority in both houses will be needed to move it to a ballot question in 2022. Depending on the makeup of the legislature two years from now, this may die, but we don't know. Right now any changes in the absentee requirements will have to wait for that to pass. We do not know if there will be a special session to pass anything else this year - to do that it would have to be specific. For now, nothing pass so no harm was done, nothing got snuck into other bills that passed. It is very difficult to at the very end of the session watch out for things being added as a rider to another bill. This subverts the democratic process of having a public hearing. But luckily that didn't happen this session, so we are very thankful for that. It has happened in the past.

Q. For the new people you need to understand that yes, there are some good bills that the committee is putting forward but the most helpful thing the legislative committee does is track and try to stop the bad bills proposed from moving forward. Nothing passed is a good thing.

A. The potential this year could have been far worse for us if some of these had passed. Sue, Tim and Ryan are the three people from our organization that led the charge up there and stayed in contact with the various legislators. Representative Fox, who is the House Co-Chair, from Stratford has understood where we are coming from and even though he is a Democrat he really listens to us. He knows the harm that can be done by various things. It is the other members who can try to override him to get certain things out of committee then Ryan really steps up to the plate. He contacts other GAE members and the legislature, they put an inordinate amount of time. I can't say it often enough, how thankful I am.

Q. There was a time when ROVAC was not respected by the legislative committee but today we are. We are seen as hard working people, and communicating in an intelligent way, with the materials you are bringing forward. We thank you for all of that.

A. One more thing to add to that is the importance of having a relationship with your legislators - both your state reps and your state senators. They are overwhelmed as you can see, as bills come out with all of the rewrites and changes. When an election bill comes out of the Senate or the House, and they are wondering is this something that I talked to my Registrars about - that is a good thing. We got a call from our Senator asking us whether we said yea or nay on a bill, and we reminded him we had said no on all of the bills we talked about. That is the importance of keeping that conversation going and keeping that relationship with your legislators going. Beyond everything else we do, it all comes down to them making that vote on that day. There is a lot of pulling, and that is why our lobbyist is so very important being right outside the door when they walk out or in.

Nominating Committee Report by Charlie Murray. We are anticipating one opening on the audit committee, as Lisbeth moves up to Treasurer position. We are hoping all of the other committee members will stay on, as they are doing a great job. If anyone else is interested in joining one of the committees, please talk to a committee member to learn more about their jobs. Sharon is asking to step down from the Education Committee, so we need to step in for both Education and Audit. But Audit is statewide position, so we won't vote on that here.

Darlene asked each committee member present if they plan to continue. Anita Mips said yes for Credentials. No volunteers for education. Education plans the classes offered at the conference as a group - if anyone would like to come forward please let Darlene know (Charlie Murray volunteered). Peter said yes for Legislative, Deputy Mindy Lewis agreed to replace Lisbeth Becker on Legislative. Charlie Murray agreed to stay on in nominating. Ann and Lisbeth agreed to both stay on in Technology. Sue plans to become the chair of Ways and Means, so we will need a Hartford County committee member if she is elected. Handbook is an adhoc committee and Darlene and Sharon will continue on that. Email Darlene if anyone would like to join any of the committees.

Technology Committee Report by Lisbeth Becker and Ann Kilby. There was a change in CVRS, where the system will automatically update when a voter does not respond to the canvass in 30 days. This change was implemented on May 30th. The technology committee had been working with the SOTS office on this technology to automatically update at the end of a canvass, when someone has not responded in the 30 day time period they would automatically be moved to inactive. We were given no notice that it would occur on May 30th. I talked to Ted Bromley and got Ted and Steve Mason to come and meet with Marla, Darlene and me. Darlene attended to learn what changes needed to be made in our handbook. We talked about the negative impact caused by the surprise and by not be informed of a major change happening on our CVRS system. On the plus side, we were able to meet quickly and make some other significant changes to CVRS that will benefit us in the long run. Information on upcoming changes that have been implemented or will be implemented have been sent out in a chart form. Some of the changes are happening as a result of this, some problems found were that people who were made off outside of the canvass system were made inactive. Also all of the voters moved to inactive were showing up in the removal part of the monthly change report - which is 100% inaccurate, because we're not removing them we were just moving them to inactive. So the change that will be made immediately is the changes will now showing up in the change, instead removed, section of the change detail report. It also engendered a lot of discussion about what other things we can do and it brought to light how parts of the CVRS system were not talking to each other. The biggest change is that the canvass section of CVRS is now going to talk to the regular section of CVRS. This is a critical coding change, which the vendor of the program will need to make, Steve can only make some of these changes. As a result what is going to happening is that when you will be having a canvass and someone, John Doe is canvassed and he dies 15 days after the letter was sent. Typically, you would just move that voter off, you wouldn't go into the canvass section to make the change, you would just move to off, with death as the reason. So now what is going to happen, this new coding will make that voter, John Doe, will be dropped out of the canvass, so even though it was 30 days with no reply, an off voter will not be moved back to inactive for not answering the canvass. His name is no longer part of the canvass, so he can't be moved from off to inactive for not replying to the canvass letter. And that will be the case with any kind of action that is taken with someone who has been canvassed, when an activity outside of the canvass takes place in the interim. So, the only people who will be automatically moved from active to inactive, are those in the canvass who remain in the canvass. We have worked with this for a long time, but we weren't entirely aware of unintended consequences were going to be by moving the canvassed voters to inactive.

Q. Will this enhancement be in place for the next canvass next year, in 2020?

A. Yes, it should be.

So this document was sent to the SOTS office, and the agreement is that when these changes are made and are tested, they will notify the technology committee before they implement it.

The second thing to come out of this, beyond not catching us off guard - they have all of our emails and they could have made an announcement before hand. Unfortunately for this one, Ted was away at a conference. We do constantly ask when is the change coming.

Q. Will they rollback this change until it is fixed? We had a referendum in May and we could not figure out why one man had been put on inactive, and now we know why.

A. No, but at least with inactive status, he was able to vote. We have written a little description on how to find the folks who have been made inactive so that you can reactivate them again.

Q. What about next year when we can't do our canvass until after the Presidential Primary?

A. The 30-day clock is based on when you send the letters, that date. And it is updated daily. This should not be confused with your start date of your canvass; this is the date you put in as the send date of the letter. So if you create the letters ahead of time, just be sure to put in the correct send date - the date you will be mailing the letters. That is the date on the system, CVRS is just looking at what you programmed into the letters.

Q. Who besides Steve Mason is doing IT work at SOTS?

A. Tom Miano is heading it up.

For technology committee members, learning about this, we need to be more specific when we discuss changes to CVRS. To be clear when we mean active voter, for example, we mean only active. We were shocked at this, moving off voters to inactive. Again, the unintended consequence will be that going forward, better changes will be made.

Q. Did we get in our monthly change report a list of what was done by this change?

A. Yes, but it would have been in the removal section that you would have seen the names of voters who were canvassed, no reply and no action.

Q. So I did not understand that. We had 3 military members who we sent canvass letters to, we intentionally did not move them to inactive. I am asking if they still live at their address, but I did not want touch them - going forward should I not send a CVR letter to military?

A. CVRS does not look at status when you send a CVR letter. Just whether it was 30 days with no reply. You may send CVR letters to people who haven't voted in four years. Why would you move those people to inactive? As Registrars you need to exercise your discretion about who you send CVR letters to. For instance, we look at the age of the voter, and don't send CVR letters to kids who are probably still in college - especially if it is likely that they will be coming back from school.

Q. Are you only talking about the CVR letters, not the 683s?

A. We are only talking about the CVR letters. The 683 is a different process.

To be clear, if you send a CVR letter, any time during the year, this automatic move to inactive will occur anytime going forward that you send a CVR letter and there is no entry = reply by the deadline of 30 days. The system cannot tell the difference. Therefore, if you are sending CVR letters as a friendly letter, be aware the system cannot tell the difference. If you are using it that way, that individual will become inactive if you do not do something to that person's record. Anytime you create a CVR letter, you will need to take action to stop the voter from becoming inactive.

Q. So when the post office returns a new voter letter, aren't we supposed to send a CVR letter? Should we do something different now?

A. That is a good question. Our office does not default to the CVR letter with a post office return of a new voter. We have some mailing problems in our town, so the first thing we do is we look for a phone number or we call the post office to ask why it was rejected, as well as make sure we entered the address correctly. Sometimes it is our mistake. We do all of that, and then we send a second letter to

the new voter with the correct address. What is the worst that can happen with this newly registered voter who you can't get a letter to? They are on the inactive list, their name still is going out to the polls, and they can vote. We are instructed if that new acceptance letter comes back, we must take action. You can do the extra work to track down why the letter was returned - but you must send a CVR letter if you don't have an answer. It has to go out.

Q. If you do a canvass history report, all of those you did outside the canvass appear, those few will be there with all the canvass voters. For this last update, it looks like they did not touch long ago canvassed people and didn't reply, why is that?

A. No, Steve ran this off the 2019 canvass information, but it will, going forward on a daily basis, be updating no replies.

We need to talk about CITRIX, because this is the next big change happening. So this is the virtual workstation that is going to be installed on everybody's computers to run CVRS. CITRIX is the name of the company that is doing it. Our town, Glastonbury, agreed to be the original test site for CITRIX. They have been in and out of the office for the last seven weeks, working with our IT department. They need to get the back-end done and then it gets installed on the computers. So when you go onto your workstation there will be a little round black and white circle and that is the icon for CITRIX. You click on that and there will be a separate sign on there. They have not issued the password policy in place yet - but there will one put in place and it is going to be the same as the other state passwords, it will need to be changed every 90 days. So after you enter the password, it will take you to a blank screen and then you have to find apps, and then the one app that is on that program is CVRS, click on that and then it will load. Next you will sign in on CVRS, just like you always are, so you will be using a separate password, just like you always do.

Some of the issues with this system are configuring for all of the different printers we use and getting Adobe Acrobat to work so that things are printing all right. They have moved from Glastonbury, they have done Middletown and South Windsor, and now they are heading to Manchester. So Tom Miano is going to be setting up a schedule but he is still waiting on is that he needs to everybody's email addresses who will be using CVRS. We are reaching out to the county chairs to pass that information along; we need everyone to do this. The email issue that is a little bit of a conundrum for some because they are in a town that does not provide them with an individual government email address. We are asking for all of you to provide emails. As soon as they have that, they will notify people in advance of their appointments. For the towns that do not have an IT staff, they will notify the folks who do the work for their town. They will be going out soon, they are about a month behind, they had hoped to start in May. He would like to have this all done at least two months before the start of Elections. He will be working with all of you to get this set up and running. The expectation is to target all of the large cities first.

The other thing you need to know is that a lot of people are working on this. The department of administrative services is doing a lot of the back end work. We are primarily working with them right now. Rick May is working on this, following through. Tom is the one who is moving forward. They are trying to make sure that everyone moving forward, that all of the Registrars have responded to their email request. But other than that, there is no difference. You just need to go into the CITRIX portal to get to CVRS, to keep things safer.

Q. Does this take precedence over the new two factor authentication roll out?

A. Yes, they originally planned to do both, but it was too much, so that will be coming out afterwards.

Q. Currently we can put multiple computers on the system, using the state router in our office. Is that going to disappear for this new system?

A. No, that stays. This is no different. You will still go into work and use the same computer, you will just have to go through the portal, just clicking the black and white circle, giving a password, to get to CVRS.

Q. So this is just a security measure?

A. Yes.

Q. So the same software platform?

A. Yes

Q. So why is someone in Hartford not directly getting back to the towns that have not responded to this email request?

A. We asked for the list from Tom, so that we could send something out. But there are some staffing changes going on, Taffy who used to be in charge of sending everything out has a new job. Not sure what the name is of the new person but we will try to get them to send this out again to the county chairs.

Q. My.rovac.org has all of our emails, why can't we provide this and send them that list?

A. You can use a personal email for ROVAC, you need to give your government emails for CITRIX.

Q. Should we supplying ROVAC with government emails instead of personal emails? This would mean I would only get the email once or twice a week, if we just use the government account.

A. You can have your government emails sent to your phone.

Q. That is high tech, I do not receive emails on my phone.

A. For CITRIX we need the government emails, that is where they are installing this system. Since for the ROVAC website you can use personal emails, it would not be a good idea to send that list.

Q. We also assured our membership that the ROVAC email list was for internal use only, for our members, not for the SOTS. On that list, our members can print out the list in an Excel spreadsheet. We could program the list to have a portion that is accessible to SOTS, but that would be a lot of programming on our end.

A. So we can't use that, or the county chair email distribution lists, because we have personal emails on it.

Ted stated that they have narrowed down to two vendors for Electronic pollbooks. It is one of their highest priorities right now, to choose a vendor, but no date on when.

Q. Is he at liberty to say who the vendors are?

A. No, but this is confidential information. But to narrow down to two is a big step.

Q. For those that have already purchased equipment may not be able to use it?

A. Yes, but you can sell the uncertified equipment, the Ipads, the laptops, etc.

Q. This is a huge financial burden, to implement electronic pollbook equipment.

A. But once certified, you can replace the handwritten checkoff list, so that will save you money. So we don't know the specifics right now, but SOTS does want to move forward on this.

Q. The downside to them narrowing to two vendors is that you can't utilize other vendors. The important benefit to some of the current systems, is that we can provide campaigns and party leaders with access to real

time numbers and information. That will go away if this gets qualified, you can't use the web based systems any longer.

A. We know that is one of the issues that they are certainly talking about. Hopefully they will think of a workaround for that. Perhaps an hour or two delay would work.

Q. All of the vendors were saying one thing or another that was contradictory to the old UConn requirements.

A. Right and they are still working with UConn on this.

Q. Do we have any idea on the timeframe to get something out there?

A. No, I think they would like to get something by the Presidential.

Q. Do we know anything about the funding, once it is approved? Will the state be covering this through bonding, instead of the towns?

A. We are not aware of how that will work. There was a whole list of potential uses of the bond money that was secured and they have spent most of the money on the new memory cards with no batteries. So it is our understanding that most or all of the bonding money has already been spent.

Quick update on EMS - the Election Management System. We have had some issues with it. Stuart Wells from Norwalk has been working on this for eight years. He has beautiful and detailed information about how to make this system work better. So you can look and see if your numbers are correct, that the totals are adding up uniformly. The vendor, supposedly in February, has done the first patch on it, but it is still not there yet. Hopefully by this Election in November we will have a system that actually reads just like what is on the tapes from your memory cards. You will be able to see easily at the bottom if your numbers from the subtotals match the totals at the bottom. It will balance, and if it comes out zero at the bottom, you will know you don't have any problems. If it comes out with a different number than you will immediately know you are out of balance. They are working on something to so that towns with multiple districts could send in their summary results and afterwards back fill in the district details the next day, when you are bright eyed and bushy tailed as opposed to exhausted after a long day.

UConn is gathering statistics on maintenance problems with the tabulators. SOTS has been stockpiling parts especially reader heads and batteries. They are looking at a five year plan for replacing the tabulators with new ones.

Q. Aren't the current tabulators outdated already and need to be replaced now?

A. Yes and no, the contract is still in effect for yearly maintenance - it is a 20 year contract. What UConn is keeping track of is what are the maintenance issues, is it primarily the readers, the rollers, any of those things. They are trying to keep track of what is going, and when. One of the comments they have made about these tabulators, because we have an old style tabulator, is that they are such basic equipment that aren't many things that could go wrong with them. It is not a bad thing to be using them right now. They updated the memory cards which is certainly very helpful. You need to make sure that the maintainer is coming in and taking care of your equipment annually. LHS is now reporting on what are the major issues they are fixing. The newer generation of tabulators would store ballot information right on the tabulator which would mean if for example someone has overvoted, they would need to fix their ballot - they won't have the option to get a new ballot. So all of the new features need to be considered.

Q. So they were purchased in 2007, and we have a 20 year contract on them?

A. Yes, we have eight years left.

Q. There was a conference call a few weeks ago, a webinar on cybersecurity, which SOTS asked us to listen to. After twenty minutes we gave up, it did not seem useful.

A. It got better at the end, a lot of technical information, but at the end they wrapped up with some practical notes for cyber security. The PowerPoint with detailed slides was going to be available on their website. They did promise a follow-up report for those of us who could not attend.

Q. For a large part of that conference call the guy kept breaking up, (they were having technical difficulties), and we couldn't hear him.

A. When they wrapped up at the end, you could hear them again. If someone could send the powerpoint to Darlene, she can send it out to the membership.

Q. At the conference, the SOTS promised a big cybersecurity meeting for next week, and we were asked to save the date, but we have heard nothing about it. Is she still doing it?

A. Yes, originally they were thinking of inviting everybody. But it ended up being limited to 100 participants - and the meeting also includes Town Clerks and local IT departments, just a few from ROVAC. Peggy called Sue Larson and said ROVAC would only get 20, so we sent 16 names from the Board and the Technology Committee.

Q. Did the Technology Committee meet on May 23rd?

A. Yes, that is what we have been reporting on. Our next meeting is on July 25th, everyone is welcome. We always have the meetings in Glastonbury at 300 Wells St, our Riverfront Community Center.

Q. Hartford has been having a lot of issues with the DMV errors, wrong town, wrong address - is this a Technology Committee issue? We have to constantly email Steve. We have had candidates whose address has been changed in error by DMV.

A. Yes we have been discussing this issue with Tom last week. The person you need to contact is Tiffany Hardwick at the DMV to resolve their errors - Steve Mason can only make corrections in CVRS. Tiffany will get back to you the actual backup data. She can email you the documentation. She is very good and will respond quickly. Tiffany can pursue to correct any clerical errors they may have made, (Steve Mason will still need to correct the information in CVRS if it was sent to the wrong town.) Her email address is: Tiffany.Hardwick@ct.gov When people are doing the work at DMV, they do not have a check and balance system. Tiffany is the best person to contact, especially for specific issues.

Q. Why are there so many clerical errors at the DMV? Why aren't they using an electronic system instead of manually entering it in?

A. Because they haven't finished with their upgrade. It is our understanding that right now the DMV is working on their internal workings, to improve it, and then they will work on the voter registration portion of this. It is supposed to be done by August 2020, originally it was December 2019, but we did get word that it will now be August 2020.

Q. So will this mean that the manual entry will be done, and the individual will be able to enter it themselves at a kiosk?

A. Hopefully.

Q. We used to be able to put in with the DMV numbers in the inquiry section, now this doesn't seem to be coming up - has something been changed?

A. You have to go down the page to the little dot that says DMV and click that, for that to pop up. Also when someone is moving out of your town, you won't get that new address unless you turn your pop up blocker off. It sounds like you need to turn off the pop up blocker.

Marla has suggested that we have an improved lookup tool on all of the voter registration options that come up online. We seem to get an enormous number of duplicates, so when you are doing an online registration the voter should have the ability to go in and verify if they are already registered. We also have been looking at another drop down option for voters who have not voted in four years - they still live there, they just are not voting. This would give you the ability to designate that this person is being sent a canvass letter, but should not be moved to inactive if they do not respond. We do not have that ability now; you have to do this manually.

Q. For the Clarity online poll worker training, the State wiped out all of the old information when they updated the system of who had completed the courses. Can they track it now, for the people who finished on the old versus the people who have not done it yet? If you didn't print out a hard copy of who has taken and passed the courses, there is no way to know who took it and who didn't.

A. We will ask them. When Darlene asked about this they said we have to go by the honor system. If you take the new, updated version, that record will show. So if you are willing to take the whole thing over again, it will save the information. But they did not say you had to retake those classes just because they lost those records.

Handbook Committee Report by Darlene Burrell: We are hoping to have the poll worker training manual completed sometime before the end of July. It will then be submitted to the Certification Committee for approval.

Old Business: Make sure your email addresses have been sent to the SOTS for the new CITRIX update. We have a question on the \$15 minimum wage that was just passed. Will that affect our poll workers, the first increase will come this January? We will all need to keep in mind there is a minimum wage that will gradually go up when we are putting together our budgets. There are going to be four steps. Our understanding is that you cannot treat your poll workers as vendors any more, your town needs to hire them as employees. We used to do vendors, but we were told that was illegal, so we made them town employees. We had investigated this, and were told that we had to make them employees. We need to find this out. Unfortunately the SOTS is not stepping into this situation, they are choosing to not provide guidance. This is not considered part of their business. This is governed by federal and state laws (that are not part of Election law).

Q. So you if we need a legal opinion on this, we need to contact our town attorney?

A. Yes, we felt that we were forced into this, some towns did not get pushed into changing. You are your own as an individual town.

Q. We were on a conference call with the IRS a few years back, where they explained we had to make all of our poll workers town employees, not vendors. So that is probably where the drive to move from vendors to employees came from, the IRS. We are paying a flat fee for our poll workers, but we have always tracked where minimum wage was, to make sure we weren't dipping below it.

A. CT minimum wage (P.A.19-4, HB5004) as of 10/1/19 \$11/hr., 8/1/20 \$12/hr, 8/1/21 \$13/hr, 7/1/22 \$14/hr & 6/1/23 \$15/hr

New Business: Meeting dates, location and time:

MEETING DATES - Q. We need to come up with dates for next year's county meetings. Should we skip the Sept. meeting considering the primary, conference, and Labor Day are all in that month?

A. I would like to make a quick plea. At a county meeting we get hard answers. At conferences we attend classes and then we meet at lunch and the people at your table got different information when we discuss it. You have no idea which way it went. If we have a meeting after the conference, we can clarify those issues that come up at the conference, so that is why I would like to have one.

Motion made for September 24th, seconded and carried.

The second Tuesday in January is the 14th. General agreement for January 14th.

The second Tuesday in March is the 10th. General agreement for March 10th.

For June the second Tuesday is the 9th, might be the day we have to be in the office from 1 to 4 pm.

MEETING LOCATION - General agreement for Windsor Town Hall.

MEETING TIME - General agreement was to meet at 10 am to avoid traffic issues on Rte 91.

Sue Larsen asked if you would like to contact her quickly, do not use the ROVAC president email. Use either her personal or government emails. sewl@sbcglobal.net or sue.larsen@southwindsor.net

Q. The law now says we have to print all of the voters' addresses. What are we supposed to do with them?

A. This has been in question, does the Freedom of Information Act require us to not suppress addresses upon request? This happened in 2012. Only if they have the special card from the SOTS are we to put people on the suppressed voter list. The SOTS issues cards for domestic situations, for people who work in DCF, troopers, domestic violence victims, etc. Those with valid reasons can get a special card, and then you need to suppress their address.

Q. Tom Hennick answered this a few years back when he spoke at our conference about FOI and what we needed to know. He said this is a grey area of the law and that you do not need to change those who are already on the suppressed list. This is a judgement call on your part, if you know that someone on your suppressed list is not qualified to be on it. (grandfathered?) You might want to question your town attorney regarding the 2012 law. You would really be dealing with it, if you get a complaint

Motion to adjourn at 11:27 am. Seconded and passed unanimously.