

Hartford County ROVAC Minutes - Tuesday, January 9th, 2018

Chairperson Darlene Burrell called the meeting to order at 9:30 am, and thanked our hosts, Linda Cultrera and Marie Fox for providing such a great location for our meetings. Darlene added extra notes to the agendas that she printed up to save folks from having to do so much extra note taking.

Please email our ROVAC president at [rovacpresident@rovac.org](mailto:rovacpresident@rovac.org) with the current contact information for any local media publications/newspapers that you would like them to publish the statutory notifications for Elections and Primaries that she will continue to provide. Some of the contact information provided in the past is no longer working

Regional election monitors have been asked to design an electronic method of keeping an updated schedule of moderator certification training classes online which would be available to Registrars. It would be a source that could be updated daily. Currently there are 7 trainers available: Darlene Burrell, Carole Kleinfield, Sue Larsen, Karen Lyons, Chris Prue, Matt Waggner and Stuart Wells, (Tim Becker is being trained to be a trainer).

CITI has created 3 new classes for continuing Registrar certification maintenance that have been approved: Office Productivity (How to use Excel), Supervised AB Ballot/Poll worker training, and File Management & Resource Availability. The cost is \$200 per class, it is unknown how many hours of training each class will count towards the required 8 hours annually. These classes are not required, it is just an option to get your continuing education hours. It is still required to pass moderator certification every two years.

Four of the fall 2017 conference classes can be used toward the eight hour yearly required training to maintain registrar certification. The EMS system class by Shirley Surgeon counted, but the Q & A session with Ted and the special speaker they brought did not count. Classes for the spring 2018 conference will be reviewed ahead of time, so you will know which ones will count as training hours. At this time training is available at conferences and CITI. (According to Kevin Ahearn the four hours of moderator certification training may not be used toward the eight hours)

ROVAC is working at making sure that the 8 hours is covered at our two conferences. CITI classes are an extra option. There are other options out there. If you attend training offered by your town, for example, an IT class on Excel, and you have a written copy of the material, you can send that to the certification committee, and then SOTS, for approval. Unfortunately, everything has a cost, unfunded mandates are hitting us everywhere. We have moved from a required 10 hours down to 8 hours, so that is a reduction in the requirements. Training provided at county meetings will only count toward the required hours if approved by the Certification Committee. Hartford County meeting attendance is kept for that purpose.

Vice Chair Report by Sharon Krawiecki. welcomed new Registrars Beverly Jackson from Burlington, and Rose Horan from Windsor Locks.

Secretary's Report by Laura Wolfe, I work at recording the details provided by our speakers, who are intelligent people, like the DMV explaining their process. For example Sharon mentioned the only items added when people fill in a voter registration are party and phone number. What happened to the boxes for former address and former name and if they would like to work at the polls? I don't think she missed that, I would guess the clerks are not required to add that when they send it along to us.

Darlene stated that we will be looking to get these hours at county meetings officially approved - whatever that process becomes. Please use the notes as a reference. We had a very good speaker from the Governor's office at the last meeting, speaking about the Department of Justice ruling, so read them carefully when they do get sent. Also, I am trying to get clarification with SOTS on something that was brought up at that meeting, but thus far we do not have an answer. If a elector moves from one town to another within Connecticut and they do not fill in the party field, it was unclear what to do. Do they start out with a clean slate, or do they keep

their party affiliation? We were told by these speakers that the party must be carried over. The Department of Justice under the HAVA laws has taken the position that there should be minimal impact when a voter moves within the state, no unnecessary inconvenience to the voter. If they have already affirmed that they are a party member, they should not have to reaffirm that because they moved to a different town. Therefore, there is no clean slate, so you do carry the party over. So far, this directive has not come from the SOTS.

Treasurer's Report by Sue Burnham. We are collecting \$6 per town for the county basket for the spring conference (\$3 per Registrar) today or at the March meeting. Are there any volunteers to make the county raffle basket? Seeing no volunteers I will do it again. Our last theme was beer and wine, we may do that again. \$6 per town is believed to be a sufficient amount to make a nice raffle basket. Our next meeting is in March, but if you have the \$6 per town for the convention baskets today I am collecting money now since we would like to start shopping for the county basket.

Audit Committee Report by Lisbeth Becker. A final report for FY 2017 ending June 30<sup>th</sup> was done. A meeting will be held in February to discuss FY 2018.

Convention Committee Report by Ann Clark. Convention dates are April 25, 26, and 27<sup>th</sup> at the Radisson in Cromwell. The cost to attend the whole convention is \$265. The room rate is \$96 per night. The fall convention will be in Danbury, September 20 and 21<sup>st</sup>. The committee is looking around for other places, but are finding most prices exorbitant. We are discussing using email, rather than a meeting and we are all set with our planning. The September dates are locked in now.

Education Committee Report by Sharon Krawiecki. Committee chair, Melissa Russell held a well-attended Education Committee meeting two weeks ago, about eight people. We came up with eight or ten topics to continue to find presenters for. Next meeting is January 25<sup>th</sup>. This conference is well on its way and it is going to be great. We plan to have all the presentations approved by the Secretary of State prior to the conference so you will not have to worry about not getting your hours.

Legislative Committee Report by Pete Gostin and Lisbeth Becker. The Legislative Committee is made up of large and small towns. This year's session of the General Assembly is a short session, which means that there are only three months to it. Therefore, any bills that are raised need to come from the committee itself, usually the chairs, or by the Secretary of State. We discussed a variety of different bills. We are looking to pass our legislative packet as an individual bill that will come from the committee. It will move all primary dates to August, right now September primaries can be very difficult with schools being open. We are trying to make things consistent, year to year, regardless whether they are local or state, all primaries in August.

We are also working with the Secretary of State for some cleanup language and clarifications regarding petitions. Right now, we are getting conflicting information from the attorneys and our interpretations. When we have new registrations coming in during the petitioning process, some Registrars add them to get a new percentage of signatures required based on the total of party registrations on the date the petitions are due, others use the original party numbers from date the petitions were issued to calculate the number of signatures required. The committee is not taking a position, they merely are asking for a clear decision from the Secretary of State. We would like to see the number of required signatures consistent statewide. We are also asking for the post-election audit timeframe to be changed, so that the selection of towns and alternates, and notification to towns, is done within 72 hours of the Election. We are also asking for an online SOTS directory/repository of information. This has been requested for a long time by ROVAC, we are looking for answers to current common questions, we are not asking the Secretary of State to go back to retrieve old information from their archives. This would be a place to store directions and information about current laws and their interpretations. It would be helpful to the attorneys to have their frequently asked questions in an accessible and searchable space, so they don't have to repeat the same answers repeatedly. And it would mean the same information would be given out to all of us. There will a meeting on January 18<sup>th</sup> to go over all of this, and to find out what

the Secretary of State's agenda is for this year. We are hoping to get our items acknowledged and perhaps put these in a bill that they are putting forward.

Melissa is working on a technical bill which has a variety of cleanup language. We would like it clarified that the 10 hours of training, can be eliminated, repeal completely 9-192 (b) It is confusing to have 8 hours of training (per certification) and 10 hours still in statute. We are looking at all of the notifications that we are required to do, regarding registration sessions, we are hoping to amend that in addition to newspaper, or instead of, online notification on a town website would be sufficient. It should not require print notifications using newspapers for each town, it can be done electronically. Paper lists printouts are still required by statute, but this is a pre-CVRS holdover, we can now print lists daily, on demand - so eliminate section 9-35 (a) There are still some Board of Admissions references that need to be repealed or deleted, as they are no longer used: 9-15 (a) and 9 -17 (a). We are researching the requirements to print a registry list 9-39, 9-172 (a) and (b). The tabulator tender is required to be from in town, 9-233, other positions don't have this requirement, you should be able to hire from neighboring towns. We would like to delete the reference to in town. We think all these technical changes are non-controversial stuff and we are hoping to get the GAE leadership to sponsor this.

There are a few things that we will not be pursuing. The \$35 per day per diem was discussed, many options were suggested, such as an hourly wage, decision was made to leave this to the membership to decide at the fall conference as part of the survey. Next year with the longer session, if we have a clear direction for ROVAC, we may want to pursue that. Because some towns are using them, electronic pollbooks we are leaving alone. Pushing for certification at this point might result in their elimination. It has been two and a half years that we have been waiting for a system to pass certification, with silence from the Secretary of State. It looks as though the recommendations from Professor Alex, the researcher at UConn, that he is never going to be in favor of electronic pollbooks. This is in limbo, but rather than force some action for approval, we decided to avoid the potential counter of just eliminating the provision that allows their use. For now, it is the status quo, do what you will do, just understand that if you decide to use one of the current systems, sometime in the future it might not be certified. You will be out the money. Currently you still must do both, legally you still need the paper. No vendor has been certified by the SOTS yet.

We are also considering the unknown vote. When someone votes twice for a candidate that has been cross endorsed, we are asking them to change the name of that vote to unassigned vote. It is not unknown. In the past we have been given a map for the redistricting that are not detailed. We are also asking that we get accurate information when the redistricting is done, as the redistricting commission has that precise mapping information with very specific details. We want to make sure we are on the front end of that detailed and accurate information for the 2020 redistricting. Many towns do not have the GIS system that allows your engineering department to use, to get the details.

For one polling place towns, there is a statute, section 9-258, that allows Registrars to act as Assistant Registrars in the polling place, while the law states that you should be in your office on Election day, this would allow you to act as the Assistant Registrar at the polls. This will clarify your ability to do this, if you have an Assistant Registrar working in your office. This will allow those who have more than one district, but one polling place, the ability to leave your office on Election Day. We are trying to allow Registrars to be able to go to their polling place if there is an emergency at the polls. In the certification classes, we were taught that Registrars had to be in your office unless they were a one district town, so we want this clarified. The Deputy or Assistant Registrar should be able to cover your office, but we need this clarified.

ROVAC day will be, tentatively, on Wednesday, April 11th from 1:00 to 4:00 pm. We will get this firmed up at our next meeting, in mid-February.

Q. With the short session, are we correct in hoping that you will get a lot done, because the last session not much got done?

A. No, the last session was the first time that we had an even number in the Senate, of each party, so you had two chairs from the Senate and one from the House. Therefore, there was a lot of bantering and a lot of strange stuff going on because everyone was getting used to having three chairs instead of two. On top of that the chair that we started with had too much to do, and left GAE in the middle, so we had a new chair in the middle. With the learning curve, no one got much out of the GAE for that session, last year - including the Secretary of State. Usually they just pass her bill over to the House and Senate, but that did not happen. For the past couple of years, we have done very well with Sullivan & LeShane as far as legislation.

Sullivan & LeShane (our lobbyists) will be helping us. They will be pursuing everything we just went over on our behalf as well as looking for any bills that will affect us, or be detrimental to how we administer our offices and will fight for us. I can't say enough about how much they have done to represent us, they are on top of it on every issue. Ryan came on board this year to be our representative and is the former mayor of Torrington. So, he knows all the ins and outs of the issues of budgeting etc. He was the youngest mayor to serve and he is very well versed in the legislative process and will be going to bat for us on many of these issues. He is very helpful. Sullivan and LeShane is our hired lobbyist and they are one of the top lobbyists in the state. They help us decide on how to approach issues, because they are so familiar with the process. It is extremely helpful to us as an organization to have them.

Q. Is new legislation being proposed to change moderator certification from 2 years back to 4 years? This is a financial burden on the towns. It is the Registrar's job to train their poll workers. I thought we were going to try to get rid of all of the voter making sessions for 12 hours and 4 hours before Elections and Primaries. Registration is available online, why should we have to be in our offices for all of those mandated hours?

A. Regarding moderator training fees, we did talk about that. This is going to be an ongoing discussion. We are looking at it from the perspective of those moderators who participate in training every year, and have different training requirements for someone who is used sporadically. The decision to not bring it up right now, until there was more discussion, with an agreement to present an alternative. Maybe that alternative could be three years, instead of two or four years. This is not off our radar, it just is not going to be done during this legislative session, but we know about this and we are talking about it. Our decision this year was to not be aggressive with the Secretary of State in that aspect, in front of the legislature. We want to come across as wanting to have a discussion with the Secretary of State's office and approach our agendas like a team wherever possible. We are working together instead of in opposition, we had been doing for quite a while. That does not mean we will approve everything the Secretary proposes, we don't know, but ROVAC will never do anything against Registrars. For those things that we can both support, we will bring things forward together and that is a win-win for everybody. We are having a sit-down discussion with Denise to talk about our issues, particularly the cost factors and personnel factors. We know that a lot of moderators, when they introduced the two-year training, just gave up saying, "I have had enough." We are aware but are coming at this from a different perspective. Same thing with the mandatory hours for voter registration. We got a lot of push back from some Registrars who said that they work on an hourly basis, and since these hours are mandated the town must pay for them, and those hours are used for getting polls setup and making lists - a lot of work and every minute of that time is used. If you take those hours away our town is not going to pay for the hours of preparation needed. We have been in a quagmire, as to what would be the best way to do this. We are putting in extra hours technology wise, we don't need to for the actual voter registrations, but again you have towns whose budgets are so tight that if it is not mandated, those hours go away and the Registrars won't be paid to put the Election together. This seems like an awful choice, but that is the reality for many small towns. We had a long discussion on this, whether we

could reduce or get rid of those mandated days. We found too many Registrars really need those hours, so that is why we left that in.

Q. Thank you so much for saying that, because we are one of the towns that use every single one of those hours. When the Deputy Secretary of State came to visit us, we discussed all of the things that we do during those mandated hours - how valuable they are to us. His response was that you should do a class. We do poll worker training, we pack up our supplies, we use every minute.

A. That is the big thing with the legislative committee, we have to take into account the large towns and the small towns and their needs are very different even though we are all working with the same laws. They need to work for a big variety of needs.

Q. But aren't these voter registration sessions an unfunded government mandate?

A. Yes, sure, they are unfunded, but towns are required to cover them.

Q. I applaud you for taking the softer side approach to working with Denise. But regardless whether it is a short or long session, we should get a timely response from their office. I am still waiting for an answer from Ted Bromley for an answer to an email from one year ago, and a phone call from three weeks ago, that has to do with elections. We will get fined if we don't do things properly, we are trying to follow state statute, but so many things are unclear. Where are we? It is nice to play friendly and to compromise, but at some point, the Secretary of State should have to step up and protect what we have to do in our jobs. So, although I thank you for being willing to compromise but we need some teeth. This is an Election year where she is on the ballot, running for her office, so if she is going to make some improvements, now is when she should be doing it.

A. We agree with you and we have some lobbyists who are very strong. Also, in previous years we have only met with Peggy and Shannon, so Denise was not discussing things with us directly. This year we are meeting with Denise, Shannon and Peggy to make sure that Denise hears everything we have to say. It is not that we agree with everything she says or that we are being too nice. We are agreeing to discuss our differences together, instead of airing it in front of the legislature first. That is a big difference. For example, last year when we proposed to include ROVAC in one of the statutes for education, Denise pulled Melissa out and yelled at her because she thought we were already doing that and how could ROVAC embarrass the Secretary of State in front of the legislature. We are taking the position that we are not going to go in proposing legislation first, that we are going in and talking to her directly about what impacts us, will you put it in your legislation, so that we can support that and be 100% behind you. It is coming from a different direction, it is a different tactic that we are going to try this year. Whether it works or not, I don't know, but we think it is worth the effort in the short session to try this.

It is very important for Registrars to write down the things they would like the legislative committee to look into and send it to them early. That is how the committee came up with the current list of items that was put forward. The surveys that came out of the fall conference are very important, they drive what the legislative committee considers. The legislative committee needs time to go over the ideas and formulate what our agenda is going to be, moving forward. Right after the fall conference we start meeting, putting the results together and listening to what the surveys are saying. Is there an action that we can take? How can we formulate that? What is the best approach? Can we do this in a different way, come at it from just our standpoint, or do we try to get the GAE committee leadership to get onboard? We talk to them all the time, explaining things to them - it is hard work. Melissa, Sue and Tim do a lot of this work, and have done it for years. September through December is when we really develop what we are doing as an organization.

Q. Regarding our questions asked to the SOTS and not being answered - Years ago we used to be able to call and talk with someone right away or at least get a phone call right back. Now if you send an email you don't always get an answer. What should we do?

A. You can send your questions to the ROVAC president, Sue Larsen and she will try to get an answer.

Q. What is happening with the DMV system and party enrollment changes with in-state moves? When you print the card, it shows only a blank for party and it is labeled an address change. Sometimes we get voter phone calls if we changed the party, and sometimes we get phone calls if we didn't change the party, so which is it. We are getting hit from both sides, some voters want to keep their party and some do not - but it is blank, so what should we do? I remember Ted said he will get back to us on this.

A. Darlene sent an email to Ted and Peggy a week ago asking for a written clarification of the proper procedure when processing new in state moves, so far there has been no response. But DMV registrations are a whole separate issue. So if we are talking about new DMV registrations that come to you in CVRS, this is very clear, we do not change if the party space is blank on the DMV registration form.

Q. We need a definitive answer, because we are getting complaints from the electors if we leave them in their party and if we move them to unaffiliated. You are damned if you do and damned if you don't.

A. We are trying to get this straightened out. The DMV and DOJ are forcing us to leave the party affiliation alone when it is an in-state move. This should happen automatically now, so you don't need to do anything - with DMV you do not have to deal with this. There is a driver to this which encompasses any registration, and what the Department of Justice has said is that we should not require the voter to have to provide any more information than what they are changing, only what is absolutely necessary. So if they are saying and doing that at the DMV, we think it also means for any kind of registration that you receive. Every kind of form, wherever they fill out their registration, party moves with their record UNLESS the voter specifies otherwise. The Department of Justice under the HAVA laws has taken the position that there should be minimal impact when a voter moves within the state, no unnecessary inconvenience to the voter. If they have already affirmed that they are a party member, they should not have to reaffirm that because they moved to a different town. When Mr. Deleana from the Governor's office was talking about this during his presentation, he really hit hard on that particular point. This is one of the drivers on the new DMV system. Minimal work to the voter.

Q. Why is it that we have not gotten this explanation from SOTS in writing? Don't we need to have their interpretation in order to implement this change? So what about the new applications we receive online? What if the voter checked no?

A. In that case the voter is asking for no party, so you would change to unaffiliated. Leave the party as is if the box is blank. There is only an issue if nothing was selected in the party box. The Judicial department looks at each state as a unit, they don't look at it like we do, with each town having its' own voting districts. Wherever you are in the State of Connecticut, that is how they look at your voter registration. It is immaterial whether you are registering online, in-person or with the DMV - this doesn't make any difference. We are the State of Connecticut, so if you move within the state your party status moves with you. We have asked SOTS for a ruling in writing, as this is our assumption that we got from the presenters. By law, SOTS is the department in charge of interpreting the law for us, so we are trying to get this in writing from them. Legally a DOJ decision over rules any other interpretations, and the Governor's office did take the lead on this because we were getting sued and they had to put something in place.

Q. So to clarify this, if you receive by mail, or if your town clerk accepts a voter application, in which the voter has moved from one CT town to another CT town, if they were in a party in their old town, even though they left the party space blank on the application, because they skipped that section, the new town should leave them in their same party status. Whatever it is, the new town does not change it?

A. Yes.

Q. And for within town moves, the same party status stays the same?

A. Yes

Q. So there was that question where some towns were keeping the party and others were changing to unaffiliated to give voters a clean slate when they moved in if the box was blank, that we needed a signature

affirming party affiliation on the new application - but now we are uniform, we do not change party status it remains when a voter moves within town or state?

A. Correct. If you think about it, if the voter is only changing their address, why would you change them to unaffiliated. The voter already knows what party they are in, they have already registered with a party. Why would you change that just because of an address change? They already filled out their party preference. Just look at it as just the address is changing.

Q. But we do have voters who come into a new town anticipating a clean slate. What right does the new town have to fill that in, when it was intentionally left blank. Now you have left them in a 90 day lockdown if they decide to change their party. The voter never asked to be put in a party if it is blank. This is why we want a legal clarification on this issue from the SOTS.

A. We agree that we should get SOTS to give us a clarification, that would be a good thing. We were given the opposite opinion previously from SOTS, Ted told us that unless the new town had it in writing, the voter should be moved to unaffiliated. While this seems fairly clear, we will still try to get it in writing and if we do, we will send it to you.

Nominating Committee - no report

Technology Committee by Lisbeth Becker and Ann Kilby. Since our last county meeting the technology committee has met twice, with a discussion between members and guests. In summary, we asked the chair, Lisbeth, to send a letter to the SOTS, asking for certain information.

1) The possibility of converting the SOTS Election calendar into the Outlook calendar

2) Request a class at the next conference with the correct way to deal with duplicate voters - Wethersfield Registrars have developed a great process for dealing with duplicates, but it didn't fit in at the fall conference. (We had requested that Ted and the Wethersfield Registrars be our guest speakers for this meeting, but the program was not done yet.)

3) Request that the DMV presentation at our last county meeting be presented at the next conference so that all of the Registrars could hear about it from the DMV contact.

4) We would like to know the status of electronic pollbooks.

5) We would like to have a fix in CVRS so that we don't have the half page of instructions print, as it wastes a lot of ink.

6) We would like to know the status of the poll worker module, so that we could have documentation of who are poll workers are. The software company has this and it is currently in use in Georgia, why not use that in Connecticut. Stuart Wells thought this was a very good module.

7) In the change detail report, in the far column, instead of printing the user name of who pulled the voter, it would be more helpful to have the name of the old town. So for example instead of seeing "AKilby" you would see "Marlborough"

8) Change the report function, so that all reports could be in a format that could be directly downloaded into Excel format. The current pdf format is difficult to convert. That way old reports would be searchable by name, etc. The Monthly Report is really difficult to use after it is converted from pdf, with too many headings, and we just want the basic data.

9) We would like to know the status of the canvass batch we wanted. This was the change Marie suggested, where all of the canvassed voters appear in one report, just like the who voted, and you could click once to move the no replies to inactive status.

Our next Technology meeting is on Jan 25th. The other issue we will be dealing with is the Election Management System. The Secretary of State has said that it will be required for this upcoming Election and Primary. And our issue is that they made something like 50 changes to it after the Presidential and then they did open it up for the Municipal Election, which wasn't planned originally. Our next step is to get the information formatted as it is loaded into the Election Management System to duplicate how the tabulator receipt reads making it easier when entering data into the EMIS system, not piecemeal. You will be able to

input the blanks and the write-ins etc., so you can double check your numbers inputted to be sure they exactly match. Stuart Wells has been working with SOTS on this, but they have wanted just the information they need, not the other numbers, as quickly as possible. So what we have argued is that at the end of a very long, fifteen hour day, to ask pollworkers to reconfigure the numbers differently for EMS, jumping around for the correct ones doesn't make sense. Why not have them just duplicate the tally - reading it exactly as it appears.

Q. Could I get a clarification? I have asked Taffy, but have not gotten an answer. When you key the numbers into EMS, there is no way to get a total at the end of the data entry, only totals after it is submitted?

A. No, you must have your Head Moderator work around this. The stated goal of the Secretary of State is to get fast results and get the information out as quickly as possible. The goal is not accuracy.

Q. When changes are made to EMS the SOTS needs to communicate those changes to us, rather than us finding out when we are calling them. We used to be able to submit each district, one at a time. Now you can't do that. Now they make us wait until you are ready to submit everything because they have a live feed - which means you are a 0% district until you are a 100%. Everyone is hovering over their live feed, wanting to see some results. We were trained on single district submission, they need to let the users know when they change things.

A. Thank you, we will pass that on.

Q. We got a call from a woman who was asking why the reported results were not the same as EMS. What happened, it looks like they are not taking the widget numbers and adding them in properly. So, when you ran this report, the numbers don't add up. Did anyone else get a call from this woman?

A. So you are going back to the Presidential Election - yes, we understand. What happened was when you entered the information you had to click on the widget to get it to calculate the unknown votes before you processed your numbers.

Q. No, we are not talking about that - we did not have a problem with that. This is a report, and I will try to find it for you, that we pulled from there and put on our website, it had total numbers. This woman was auditing the numbers. She may have been a lawyer, or part of the DOJ issue, that many people were looking into. She was right, our numbers were not right on this report. We had processed the widget properly, but that data was not showing up on this particular report. When we contacted SOTS about the error, they told us no, that you did not get that information from us. So I had to literally send them a screenshot and they still said no, and that was the end of the conversation - so we took the official report off from our website. We replaced it with a sad looking spreadsheet that we had created, rather than have the lovely formal report that was wrong.

A. Okay, so here is our question to some of you, to the larger multi-district towns: Do you also use a separate, side-by-side system with EMS to backup your numbers?

Q. No, we do not. We have been using EMS from the beginning. We eventually had to do our spreadsheet, but that is so ridiculously counter productive. We decided to use their system and see what happens, but what happened was not good for us. It makes us look like idiots. The Hartford Courant posted that our town did not put in their numbers which is insane - since they were literally in our office when we gave them the numbers. What they explained to us is they get their numbers from EMS, and there was nothing there. What we found out in our town was that our Town Clerk had not completed all of their functions. Because some of the things weren't done, we struggled. The Secretary of State needs to create a check point, so that we can make sure everything is ready for the Election. We could not get EMS to open, to do the Moderator Return because they forget to tie something in. So we need a checklist with everything that the Town Clerk needs to do. I ended up signing in as the Town Clerk and the Moderator to get everything ready to send results. Shirley called us and asked why was I doing that, and I told her, things were wrong and I had to figure out what it is. Shirley does not want us to sign in as Town Clerk, but I told her I have to get this ready for the Election. This is a very important point about the EMS system. From a function and set up point of view, we as Registrars, do need to work pretty closely with our Town Clerks to ensure that at the start all of our information in the system is 100% accurate. It needs to reflect all of the districts and offices on the ballot correctly. It is an onus on them to also do that, but we need a checkpoint. This is a good point to bring up with Shirley.



Q. When we are doing absentee voters, and let's say we have one hundred voters checked off as having voting. But if you reject any of their ballots before counting, the system reduces the number of people voted absentee. So if there were 5 rejected, it is reducing the number to 95 counted for absentee for example, that is not true, 100 people cast absentee ballots. This was wrong for the Presidential Election and again wrong for the Municipal Election.

A. The Town Clerks have made a big issue of this. They want some clarity on this. It would be nice if we could get a list of the known bugs or defects - but right now we don't see anything. They don't want to tell us. Please send any issues you have to our IT representatives when you send them to SOTS, We are really trying to improve communications. Especially on the Election Management System because it is now mandatory. We want to get this so it works well for all of us, for our Moderators, Head Moderators, Town Clerks and for us.

Q. Could we have EMS training at the fall conference? That would be very convenient.

A. The problem with that is that it needs laptops for everyone - a computer lab, to do hands on instruction.

Q. Couldn't each town be asked to bring one portable laptop? Each IT department could provide one.

A. Some towns will say they can't do it.

Education Committee needs a volunteer, as Sharon cannot attend the next meeting. We need someone would like to take her place, or take over for her. (None.) So we will leave this with our ROVAC President to represent Hartford County to keep us up to date.

Q. How do I contact the committees to let them know about problems or to share solutions? How do I find out where and when they are meeting?

A. ROVAC.org has all of that information or should. If you can't find it, contact Sue Larsen, and she will reach out to the committee chairs to get the information. Please note, you will need a login and password to be able to use the ROVAC website. There was a wait to get your username and password approved by the webmaster, so it is a really good idea to do that now. Then when you need to use the site, you will be all set. General information is available without the log in, but personal information such as Registrar's emails are protected.

Handbook Committee Report by Darlene Burrell. The updated handbook will be available one week before the Spring Conference.

Old Business: Our next meeting is March 13th and we are going to try and get Ted and Camille to present their ideas on how to handle duplicates. Any suggestions for guest speakers for future meetings, please let me know. We have had Ted, Peggy and Scott, I'm not sure how often you would like them to come in. Let me know what subjects you would like to see covered as well.

New Business: The Judi Beaudreau scholarship fund is going for high school poll workers who are going to college. Please let me know of anyone who would be a good candidate, email the student's name and email address so we can put them into a pool. I am not sure how many scholarships we will be able to have this year, but ways and means will work that out. This is a drawing, no need to write-up an application. This does not include interns for your office. We will do the drawing at the Spring Conference. Currently there is \$800 in the account and we have any surplus in our budget, we will move that money to create additional scholarships

Motion to adjourn by Peter Gostin. Seconded by Sue Burnham. Motion is approved unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 11:22 am.