Hartford County Meeting - January 13th, 2015

Guest Speakers: Ted Bromley, Peggy Reeves and Jamie Spallone. Subject: Pollbooks, Registrar Certification, Duplicate Voters & Online Voter Registration and Canvass

- -

Chair Darlene Burrell began the Hartford County Meeting at 9:30 am, welcomed nine new Registrars to the meeting, and had everyone introduce themselves.

Secretary's Report by Laura Wolfe. The January minutes were just sent to the chair and will be forwarded to the membership.

Treasurer's Report by Darlene Burrell in Sue Burnham's absence. $3 per registrar will be collected at our March meeting to cover the cost of the raffle basket for the Spring Conference.

Ways and Means Committee Report by Peter Gostin. A Hartford county representative for the Ways and Means Committee is needed, as Laura Hunt has resigned as Registrar of Avon.

Audit Committee by Darlene Burrell. A new Audit committee member will be needed, as Mary Rydingsward was not reelected as Registrar of Bristol. This is a statewide position that will be voted on at our annual meeting at the Spring Conference.

Convention Committee report by Ann Clark. No meetings yet, but the dates for the Spring Conference will be April 22 to 24 in Cromwell. Chris Prue is the new chair of the convention committee, as well as the new Registrar of Vernon.

Education Committee report by Darlene Burrell. No meetings as yet, but Melissa Russell is the new acting chair of the committee. Anticipate a day of ROVAC classes, a day for ROVAC business meeting and election of ROVAC officers plus a day of SOTS classes.

Legislative Committee report by Peter Gostin. A list of election reforms was distributed. Michael Doyle has left our lobbyist firm and Paddi LeShane is guiding our approach to deal with all of the proposed election related legislative changes. They are meeting regularly with SOTS staff and Town Clerks Assoc. to work together on legislation.   Per Denise Merrill at last meeting she does not plan to put anything forward this session. Another ROVAC Day at the Capitol is being planned. Some of the ROVAC proposals do not need a statutory change, but can be reached through negotiation with the SOTS as regulation.   Some of the proposals are a reaction to the Legislative Survey from the fall conference. While the deadline to submit new bills has past, ROVAC began the process early with submitting proposals to the GAE, and it will be a collaborative process to work out the language of our bills. The bills are posted now, but have not been assigned numbers yet. Expect legislative updates to be sent once numbers are assigned. The results of ROVAC's Legislative survey have not been sent yet to the membership.

Technology Committee report by Ann Kilby. Technology minutes will be emailed to membership. The committee is studying EDR implementation, investigating ways to improve, such as email instead of phone calls. They are also studying the possibility of using the tabulators to send election night results (as they are designed to do), or scanning the results printouts, instead of faxing a filled in pdf form. SOTS question: where should the posted EDR phone numbers connect to, the Registrar, the EDR location or the polls? The tech committee is still waiting to find out what specs the SOTS is considering for electronic pollbooks so the tech committee can weigh in and help create them. Nothing is certified currently. Therefore, the manual crossing off names on the official voter list is still required with or without the use of pollbooks.   Once pollbooks are

certified, towns using pollbooks will be required to have a copy of the official voter list at the polls as a backup but manual marking of paper list will be eliminated.

Memory cards shipped to UConn for testing have no confirmed chain of custody. It is not required to send them to UConn. UConn has stated they are unwilling to assume liability for misplaced or damaged cards.

Regarding EDR implementation, phone calling is still required. SOTS question: If you can not reach the old town, can you proceed to enter the registration? Some towns say yes, others say no.

Regarding town budgets, even if electronic pollbooks are certified they would still be optional. SOS question: Will we have certified vendor cost information available immediately, so that we can submit our budgets?

Meeting suspended at 9:54 am. for guest speakers

- -

GUEST SPEAKERS – Questions to and Answers from: Ted Bromley, Peggy Reeves and Jamie Spallone.

Q: If electronic pollbooks are certified, are towns still required to have a paper copy of the official voter list at the polls?

A: Yes, correct. Once there are electronic pollbooks certified you will still be required to provide each polling place with a paper voter list, but you will no longer have to cross off each name.

Q: What are the options for vendors?

A: Once the certification specifications are determined, we will put out a list of qualified vendors.

Q: Is the intention to have every town use the same pollbooks?

A: If the bonding money is available and SOTS could purchase pollbooks, then one would be provided to all towns. You would still have the option to use your current system/vendor - provided they are certified. This could also work like a grant, where towns would submit their receipts for some grant reimbursement for the equipment. (This was done for the election on wheels carriers in 2007.) We don't know the status of the budget yet, so we can't promise funding. If you have already purchased pollbooks, we don't want to eliminate those, we want to make as many available as possible.

Q: We are using "Voter Checklist" currently, as are many towns in CT. Would the SOTS be likely to ask everyone to use this system? It is designed for CT election laws and technical issues could be treated easily statewide.

A: Initially the plan is to certify a number of systems as the legislature is expecting a competitive process. That could change, but right now we expect to certify 4 or 5 vendors.

Q: Are you certifying actual hardware on which we would be using the software on for the electronic pollbooks or just the software?

A: Both.

Q: We all need our budget numbers in now to be able to use pollbooks in November. Are you looking at high-end laptops, with an extensive operating system or can we get a nominal system laptop that retails under $400? or closer to $800?

A: We are modeling after the two other states that have done this. It may not be simply a laptop, it may have to be a specific hardware that can only be used for an electronic pollbook. This would eliminate unwanted things, like a pollworker using netflix on a different tab at the polls.

Q: Can we get numbers from those other states that are already using them, so that we have something to submit in our budgets now?

A: We have some numbers. I think North Dakota was $2000 per polling station, but then we have numbers from the District of Columbia that it cost $1,000,000 to implement for their entire district. The numbers are all over the map.

Q: It is not required to use pollbooks?

A: Correct. This is optional.

Q: How many per polling place - one or two pollbooks?

A: We are still looking at that. Maybe 2 or 3 per polling place, depending on how many lines are used. For planning you would need to estimate how many voters are at each polling place, just as you do now for checkers. We are not assuming that you will need fewer lines because it is faster.

Q: The cost of adding a checker to each line, for us, is $160. What are we comparing this to?

A: Uploading the information of who voted is a big cost savings with electronic pollbooks and that should be taken into consideration.

Q: Right now our pollworkers are in the middle of a gym - there will also be substantial costs to get them connected. Are there significant maintenance costs to consider as well? The IVS system is very hard to replace, for example, those old fax machines are no longer manufactured. We need to know all of the costs associated. Will we need 16 hour batteries? When you compare the two, using people is a lot less expensive.

A: While we feel that electronic pollbooks are an advance in technology and efficiency and accuracy, to some extent we are just being reactive to a movement among Registrars who have told us that they have bought them, that they would like to use them, or that they are already using electronic pollbooks, and that they would like to use them without having to do a separate paper list.

Q: The cost to implement pollbooks is significantly different if you have one polling place versus eleven. Not being allowed to borrow computers for the day from schools and/or libraries and instead being required to maintain exclusive hardware completely changes the economic feasibility of using electronic pollbooks. Who is going to pay for it? Two years ago, we were told there would be federal money for pollbooks - is that still possible?

A: I am not sure to what statement you are referring (about federal money), possibly this was a grant we had hoped to apply for. In our current situation I would not look to the federal government for money - or help with election administration. There is a lot of dysfunction and the lack of attention in Washington is significant. The National Association of Secretaries of State have been asking for action on this aging equipment and the old technology currently being used and have asked the administration to act on that. Our SOTS believes there should be an investment in election administration. This can be done at the state level, through bonding.

We can't make any promises at this point - but we are pushing for state funding to improve technology of elections administration.

Q: It looks like we might gain an hour or two on reporting election results, and we understand that everyone wants instant results, but speed can compromise accuracy. Is it worth it to spend millions of dollars so that results can be reported on the 11 p.m. news? Yes, this system will improve things but where are the cost savings to make this worthwhile? We pay $16 per hour to input the Who Voted list, and it takes a while, but nowhere near the amounts of money presently being discussed to get and maintain this system.

A: Many good questions, first of all, there is no proposal in our incomplete legislative package to mandate electronic pollbooks. Maybe, if after a few years and 90% of towns are using them, they might become mandatory to close the loop. No one will be mandating new systems for the next two years. Regarding voter history, this is public information that is a useful service provided to our candidates and political parties. People who have voted get asked to vote again. This is also a service to academics and the media. It is mandatory to create voter history and make that information available and uploaded to CVRS. No one has to use this right away, let's see how this develops.

Q: But once you start to use it in one place there is pressure from others to use it everywhere, a sense that it is backwards when you don't have this technology - it is like the ipad.

A: We need to weigh the results, but we live in a construct. For example, we used to have to wait until March 4th for the President to be inaugurated as the President of the United States, as it took a while for the electoral college to meet and have their convention. That was the technology of the time. We moved up that date to January 20th as the technology improved. There is a certain expectation in a modern society that results will be done in a reasonable amount of time. The media has reduced the number of stringers monitoring results at the polls. Then there is the public, who wants to know, with some degree of certainty, who their elected officials will be. When the public watches the results and see that, in particular cities, results come in late, they wonder what is that about. We know it takes a while to compile the results.

Q: The advantages of electronic pollbooks regarding updating voter history versus the end of night results are two separate issues. What is the record of accuracy of using pollbooks in the states who are using this? Entering information in your office does not compare to the pressure filled Election Day issues facing pollworkers. What is the record compared to the paper check lists?

A: One of the biggest problems on Election Day is our need for statistics that night. Currently we get no statistics from some towns, or there will be less people having been checked in compared to ballots cast - both situations set off alarm bells for us. There is a definite value in a more expedient way to verify the number checked in versus the number of ballots cast. Regarding value gained, this legislation came about through ROVAC, not through the SOTS. The desire to have electronic pollbooks, and create the ability to have it, came from ROVAC. So ROVAC needs to answer those why questions. Our part is to set forth the standard so that we don't have some teenager on a pollbook watching a zombie movie on netflix, while they are supposed to be checking in voters. The questions of why are we using them, how much will this speed up things - ROVAC needs to answer that. SOTS didn't propose it. Election statistics required for the head moderator's return versus what is necessary to post results. We are looking for ways to streamline what is reported in the

short term on election night versus what is needed to be recorded for the long term. We will be approaching the legislature with these changes.

Q: Have you considered, as other states with optical scanners have done, connecting the tabulators with a phone line so results can be available immediately?

A: Yes, we looked into that. For example, Massachusetts does a combination of things. The problem is that to use the internal modem on the tabulators each town would need to purchase a gem server, which is an old fashioned fax like communication. You would have to do each tabulator one at a time. If you max out your reception on it, your tabulators would start dropping off, so there are some serious limitations to doing that. We also know some states that remove the memory cards and bring them to a central location which has a gem server. Every time you remove a memory card you risk it going back to "okay to format". We are leaning towards a compromise between networking these, given the expense, but also the opportunity to corrupt the data. For towns with multiple polling places, have them purchase one gem server. For one tape towns this wouldn't be necessary. For the towns that need them, these servers would be purchased through an IT grant. We will keep you posted on that. You will need to use a tabulator to use the gem server, because they don't make card readers, at least not for our memory cards. You'll need to use one of your tabulators to read the data to the server. There is a new type of memory card that reduces, if not eliminates completely, the risk of getting "okay to format" - so that would be part of this project. So the gem server has the ability to take in each district's information, one card at a time, and then add up the results for you.

Q: So would you be proposing that we have runners at each polling location to take these memory cards to a central location?

A: That is exactly right, but the devil is in the details. We will have to have a chain of custody process for the cards, as you do now with the machines. You would still run tapes at each polling place - just in case something should happen to the cards in transit. Runners from each polling place would go to a central location such as Town Hall.

Q: The practical parts of an election are that the moderator will need to verify before the cards are sent, so it is not going to save time, especially if the polling place has to be closed before taking the card. If you can't submit data from the polling site, you are not going to gain anything. Adding a lot of extra work for us, spending millions just to gain an hour, maybe?

A: To be fair to the three of us standing here, you are asking questions and we are answering them with as much detail as we can give you. We have admitted that the devil is in the details. We have investigated using the tabulators to send data. We are investigating using technology, but is it a mandate. No. Are we going to make you do it? No. And yes, there are other resources available and there are other things that need to happen to implement changes.

Q: Will there be a certification program for Registrars soon?

A: Yes, four very hard working and dedicated Registrars have been working on this and building on the work of Judi Beaudreau. They are Carol Hurley from Wethersfield, Carol Young-Kleinfeld from Wilton, Anne-Marie Mastroianni from Bethlehem and John Visi from Darien. Also on the committee, Attorney Lew Button

from the SOTS and Attorney Kevin Ahern from SEEC. They have done great work. Ted Bromley and Peggy Reeves also attended some of the meetings. We are very close to coming forward with a certification program. The committee is meeting regularly and should be ready to present the framework to the SOTS, with a powerpoint demonstration. These sessions will be held at the UConn satellite sites, the main one is in Stamford. Classes will be televised live to the satellite locations at the other campuses. We are still working out prices and the final outline. It is exciting and we hope to be launching soon.

Q: Will this be broken into 5 classes? Will moderator training be one of the classes?

A: Yes, 5 classes or modules. No, moderator certification will be a prerequisite, but not one of the classes. These classes will use UConn's distant learning facilities. All the sites will be available, so no one will have to travel too far.   To get certified there will be an additional requirement to have served as a Registrar for four years. New registrars will be able to take any of the classes, but they won't be certified until they complete all of the requirements.

Q: Can the deputies take the classes?

A: Yes, they can take any of the classes offered.

Q: Will there be a cost to municipalities?

A: Yes, for each section, but no details on the numbers yet.

Q: Can you chose to take one class per year, or all of them in one year?

A: Yes, you can choose when to take classes.

Q: Is this strictly classroom or will there be an online component?

A: Right now it is strictly a classroom. There will be a teacher standing in front of the room in Stanford and students can choose to go to Stanford, or they can go to one of the satellite campus locations. It will be interactive at all locations, so questions can be asked by any student to the teacher/professor and the answer will be heard by all.

Q: What about the Registrars who were certified in 1999? Are they grandfathered in?

A: No, the classes taken back then will not meet the new requirements for certification.

Q: Regarding the duplicate voter lists that were sent to everyone, we have switched how to proceed. Now instead of the old town, it is the new town that is responsible for verifying who are and are not duplicates. In the past, when the voter left previous voting address blank, even if the name and birthdate matched, the procedure was to enter them as a new voter - which created a duplicate. Because EDR takes away the worry that someone can't vote, should we presume unless it is a common name that we should take the voter when we find a match in CVRS?

A: Yes, there is less danger now of causing a problem. We are less worried about making an error. Certainly you wouldn't take John Smith without verification. Going forward, the online registration forces voters to either fill out a previous voting address or affirm they have never voted. When we send the write up to

explain how to process the duplicate list, we will look to make sure that these relatively new statutory changes that the new town investigates, and corrects as needed, their duplicates.

Q: Exactly what are you supposed to do with the duplicate list?

A: A duplicate is created, by adding the voter to CVRS when they are already registered. Once a year the data is reviewed to identify potential duplicate matches of same name and birthdate. If you are the town with the most recent registration for a voter (thus the new town), you are responsible for investigating if this is a duplicate of the same person, or twins, or just two people who happen to share the same name and the same birthdate. The old town can also check their records. Sometimes if you look on the registration card, you will see the previous address listed. More often you will need to contact the voter to clarify if they are a duplicate. A mailing is required if it is unclear if this is a duplicate. The directions that the SOTS sends out with the list detail the steps and the statute is actually quite specific in how to do this. This is why it is so important to pull the voter's record from their old town when registering new voters. Their file in the old town has all of their voting history and this information will be lost if the old duplicate record is simply deleted. Sometimes lawyers and judges request a voting record, so it is important to keep this information. If you are the new town, it is important for you to transfer the election history of the voter, manually if necessary. CVRS allows you to view the old record with the voting history information.

Q: Regarding online voter registration, could the directions be more explicit as to what it means to say you are a new voter? Several online registrations were found to be duplicates because the voters falsely identified themselves as new voters. Perhaps it could read, if you were ever registered in the State of Connecticut?

A: That is a good point, we will look into that.

Q: We tried to clarify the process for handling duplicate voters, so that records of duplicates weren't deleted by the old town without pulling the voting history onto the new record. We hit a snag in that process, so we came up with an updated form letter. I know we need approval for that. The form letter you sent is badly worded, we need a letter that the voter can understand.

A: We did receive your amended letter suggestion and we just haven't had a chance to review it yet. It is a very tough letter to get the wording correct.

Q: We seem to have a big problem with our high school students who go to college and register to vote at Storrs. Mansfield told us they never pull voters when they have a match if the new voter doesn't mention their previous voting address. Could there be some clarification sent to all Registrars of what is and isn't acceptable practices? Especially on Election Day, when we are calling about a voter, shouldn't a verbal confirmation from us suffice? And one more issue with EDR, we had towns contact us about a voter who has registered in their town, but then did not move them in CVRS, sometimes until weeks later. Shouldn't all EDR voters being entered on Election Day?

A: Yes, we are aware of these issues and we have reached out to Mansfield to clear this up. Yes, all EDR voters are to be entered on Election Day.

Q: At a previous conference it was stated that if you have a duplicate that the new town has not taken, and you have tried to contact them and still there is no action, then you can delete them. Is that correct, should we deleted duplicates after a certain amount of time?

A: If the new town refuses to take your record and you have proven it is a duplicate, then yes, you can delete them. You can also move them to off (before deleting) to give an opportunity to preserve the record, and that would be recommended. I will need to check at what point they should be deleted.

Q: You would still get them in the duplicate report if you merely move them to off?

A: Yes, you still do but the advantage is you are not deleting the voter's election records.

Q: The offs only stay there for a year?

A: We are moving the system so that regardless of reason, all offs will be one year. Previously only obits were one year, the rest were two or three, However if you're off due to felony you stay there forever or until you are restored. Technically you can restore a felon.

Q: What should you do if the previous town listed isn't in CVRS on a new voter registration card? We checked and found that minor differences in the middle name can cause the system to not find the match. Can CVRS be tweaked to find these?

A: We have already tweaked the system so that the system is now searchable in Inquiries with a very small amount of information. Just a first name and birthdate for example. When you are entering a new voter in Activities, the criteria for finding a match is very different, it needs to match first last and date of birth. To find a voter who mentions their previous voting address, you can narrow the search by choosing their old town, by street and putting in their first name or a partial last name and/or date of birth.

Q: Could we have another option for off - moved within state? Currently if you find that someone has moved to another town within Connecticut, but are not on DMV list, there is no way to enter that and not produce a letter. The closest drop down option is out of state.

A: We will look into that.

Q: On the duplicate list, is there a way to permanently mark their record, say in the memo box, as a known duplicate? We have twins with the same first and last name, different middle names who live in different towns that keep appearing on the duplicate list.

A: That is a good point, I'll ask Steve Mason. Do you put a note on their card? It is helpful to check the cards whenever a duplicate comes up.

Q: On the marking off of the absentees, by the Town Clerks, CVRS puts the A next to the house number instead of where the A should be placed in front of the name. Could you ask Steve Mason to fix that?

A: Okay, that is a good idea.

Q: Are the statutes that we go to being amended each year with all of the legislative changes? It seems like they are a little out of date.

A: It changes. They used to do a little supplement of the changes, but most recently they started inserting the effective upon passage changes right into the statutes online. We wait for the odd numbered year, because that way the acts are reproduced in their entirety. The most accurate and up to date statutes are the ones printed in the odd years for the first six months, before they change again Juneish.

Q: The last group of changes made in 2014 were dumped in the implementer bill. Will the election changes be pulled out and available and codified under the statutes.

A: Yes, if you go on the General Assembly's website, through our link, you have two options. One is title 9 and the other says supplement 2014, or something like that. If you open that up, it is only those sections of title 9 that have been amended. So it is a very short list. You need to check the supplement to ensure that the statute you are referencing is up to date. Bills are often a mash up of different statutes, but the implementer bill is a strong example. All of the bills will get codified at the end of each session.

Q: The annual canvass has four options: NCOA, phone, door to door, or postcards to all. Do most towns use the NCOA?

A: Yes, the majority use the NCOA.

Q: The ROVAC handbook chapter on the canvass is being updated to correct some confusing points. There are two vendors that most Registrars have used: Lorton Data and ROAST.

A: Steve Mason has sent the voter file off, so Lorton should have it.   So when you use the NCOA you are getting a list of people who have told the post office that they are moving in your town or out of town. These two buckets of information are kept separate by CVRS, once you identify which bucket you are in, the system sort of walks you through it. If you receive reliable information and both ROAST and the NCOA are considered reliable sources, you can move a voter within town and you are sending a letter with that information to the voter. You will know you are in the right bucket for a within town move because it will only generate an ED 683 letter.

This letter just asks if this change within town is correct. If you are doing an out of town move the only option will be to generate a CVR - Confirmation of Voting Residence letter.   This letter asks, "have you moved out of town." The important distinction is that for a within town move you are making a change to their record and then sending a letter to confirm the change. For an out of town move, you make no changes, just send a letter asking if the voter has moved out of town. If they don't get back to you within 30 days, then you are moving them to inactive. There are only two ways to make a voter inactive, if the acceptance letter is returned by the post office or the canvass letter is not replied to after 30 days and/or a post office returns it.

Q: Can we send the CVR letter to their new address instead of their voting address?

A: Yes, you can. This was a huge debate, but either method works, the argument for the new address is that it gets a better response rate. The argument for the old address is that it ensures that you are confirming if the voter still lives in your town. Use whichever method is more effective for you.

Q: If you send a friendly letter to confirm a move out of town, from a property transfer list for example, and the letter is returned by the post office, or not returned, can you move them to inactive?

A: No, you can save their name for the next canvass, but you can't move anyone to inactive using a friendly letter - it has to be a CVR. The advantage of the friendly letter is that if you get the voter to confirm the move, then you can move them to off. Within the NVRA, there is clear language limiting the time for the annual canvass. That is why you must send the canvass letters by May 1st and no voters should be moved to inactive after June 1st.

Electronic Registration Information Center: ERIC reports will be comparing our state data base with other lists in their national data base. Possibly a conference call will be done to explain the process. You can use these lists as a source of information to canvass voters and make your voter registry more accurate.

New routers were installed and new equipment is being installed in 54 towns to improve the routers functionality. If you get a letter please give it to your IT department, the system will switch over in March and towns that received a letter need to follow the directions.

It is very important that no matter what method or combination of methods you use to canvass use only one start date for this year's canvass. That way all of your canvass history reports will contain all of the changes made during the year. If you are also canvassing a not voted list, please just use one start date for your annual canvass. There is no need to send two letters to voters who were added to the NCOA canvass, just a CVR letter is needed. Don't forget your short window, you must finish by June 1st to move voters to inactive if they haven't replied to the canvass.

Q: If an acceptance letter is returned by the Post Office, do we need to send a CVR?
A: Ted will look into whether a CVR letter is required to move them to inactive.

Q: Steve Mason prepares a four year not voted list upon request, it checks specific November dates only, not other voting opportunities?
A: Correct. If you entered the dates wrong in the Who Voted, it will not recognize other voting dates. If an entire list was entered wrong it can be corrected by Steve M. Be sure to use the election date when entering the Who Voted, not the date you originally create the list. Peggy is going over the data base to ensure all towns are entering Who Voted. If you notice that you put in the wrong date before you enter the Who Voted, it is much easier to correct. Be aware that new voters are included in the not voted list and should not be canvassed. Also make notes on your card for those who are not voting and do not want to be canvassed.

Q: Could you ask Steve Mason to add back onto the Change Detail Report, in the Change section, if the voter's status has been changed to Inactive or to Active when there is a status change. At this time, when a name appears in the "Added" section of the report you know that the voter's status is "Active." When a name appears on the "Removed" section you know the voter's status is off or purged. But when there is a status change in the "Change" section of the report you know that the voter's status has changed to either "Active" or "Inactive." We can't tell by the report which it is.
A: Yes, we can ask him.

Q: Could you ask the social services and DMV not to send batches of cards during the two weeks before the election without stamping them?

A: Joan Gibson is in charge of Social Services and DMV voter registrations and she is aware of this issue and is trying to work with them.

Q: Is homeless an acceptable address?
A: No, the requirement is to provide some actual details.

Q: Is the social services office an acceptable mailing address for their clients?
A: We will ask Joan Gibson to look into it. Shelters will accept mail for their residents. Some social services agents do accept mail for their clients.

The Secretary of State is putting forward a legislative package that has several goals. The election results reporting will be improved.   Public access to offices will be improved by aggregating all state offices to have their paperwork go to the SOTS. Currently it is a mixed bag, with some state senators and representatives who serve one town going to their town clerks but multi town paperwork going to the SOTS. The SOTS has proposed uniform voting registration deadlines and being able to use online voter registration on Election Day for EDR. They have also proposed giving municipalities the option of having elections every four years, instead of two. Allowing high tech equipment for completing post-election audits. This legislative package isn't completed yet but we will let you know and keep you informed.

We are also keeping our eyes on the many possibilities we expect to be introduced. Date changes for the Presidential Primaries. Liberalization of absentee ballot access. Inconsistencies in residency requirements for candidates to be corrected. Limiting the use of the internet to post voter history information online - there are some websites that are abusing our information and demanding money to take down voter information. Changes in the ballot access and petitioning process.

We hope to demo the revised Election Night Reporting to the legislature this session. We did an internal test and hope to have it available soon. The changes to the system were made based on feedback from the town who participated in the previous tests. The long data entry forms to fill out has been eliminated. It is now a simple spreadsheet which is divided by districts so you can enter the raw data and it will add the totals for you. It will also generate the reports that are required. As much as we could there is a single point of entry, so you only need to enter a candidate's name once. We hope to test it out this May. It is a much better and much simpler solution. If you would like to volunteer send an email to Heather.

Thank you for your work in the last election, so much went well, especially how well same day registration rolled out in a busier year. Thank you for helping us and letting us come into your offices and sharing your ideas for best practices. 13,000 people voted EDR who would not otherwise been able to cast ballots.

Q: Why at times does the CVRS system run so slowly?
A: This was in part because of the router issue which is being address and will launch in March.
- -
Motion to adjourn at 12 am made by Sue Burnham, seconded by Ann Clark. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted by Laura Wolfe, Hartford County ROVAC Secretary