

## Hartford County ROVAC Minutes - Tuesday, June 12th, 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. Future meeting dates were discussed, and membership decided on moving our September meeting to the conference location, on Thursday, September 20 in the afternoon pending availability of space. The other meeting dates are Tuesday, January 8th, 2019, Tuesday, March 12th, 2019 and Tuesday, June 11, 2019.

**Secretary's Report** by Laura Wolfe. We need to vote on two sets of minutes. Right before the March meeting which was canceled due to weather, Darlene sent out the September 2017 meeting with Doug Dalena/DMV. No additions or corrections. Motion to accept by Peter Gostin, seconded by Sue Burnham and unanimously approved. We just sent out the January 9th, 2018 minutes, with the ROVAC Legislative Committee. No additions or corrections. Motion to accept by Sharon Krawiecki, seconded by Marie Fox and unanimously approved.

**Treasurer's/Ways & Means** Report by Sue Burnham. Thank you for contributing to our basket for the conference, we made \$552 on the 50/50 and on the raffle for the baskets we made \$1458, so net revenue from the spring conference was \$2010.

**EMS** - Guest speaker Shirley Surgeon cancelled due to being inundated with petitions. Darlene distributed an index for EMS as a tool to make it easier to find functions, reports, etc. The latest version of the moderator's return is in EMS. Reports electronically sent to SOTS may have a statutory requirement for a wet signature in addition. Please note that the functions you will have access to will depend on how you are logged in - Registrar, Head Moderator, or Town Clerk.

- Q. For August, will Shirley have a Head Moderators class on EMS?
- A. Yes, she will hold classes again for both Registrars and Head Moderators, because there are still a large number of towns that did not report properly. They didn't certify their results. Shirley has said the pop-up blocker on your computer must be turned off or the pop-up needed for the final certifying of the Head Moderator's Return won't work. Q.

**Audit Committee Report** by Lisbeth Becker. No report.

**Convention Committee** Report by Ann Clark. The fall convention will be back down in Danbury, September 20 and 21st.

Darlene was told by Kevin Ahern (at the last conference) that Moderator recertification training hours do not count toward the required yearly eight hours. Training is available at conferences and Citi/UConn. Kevin explained that the Moderator recertification is for a different requirement.

Q. Why isn't the SOTS providing us with this new information? We used to get a newsletter telling us what we needed to know. We need this information. Who is keeping track of our hours? If you look at the Moderator Certification list on the SOTS website, it is not updated.

- A. Make sure you let the trainer know if you have an issue with the Moderator Certification list, but before you do that, look at the date of the last update - as the information is added slowly. The regional monitors along with Todd and Chris Reisel have been working on establishing a new system to take over this function. With the new module training hours will be downloaded faster and all training hours will be shown. It will also have information on new classes and allow you to register for those classes.

We will keep a list, so we can let you know who needs certification classes. The SOTS will still have to keep their list, but at least there will be a check point. We expect this to be available within less than a year's time.

Q. What is taking so long with the project to update the ROVAC website to get the training information up? We had asked about this in January, to have the moderator training information up on ROVAC's website.

A. Todd is working on the bar code system first, to get all your conference hours up for CITI to have and he is also working with the regional moderator Doug to get that put up. It is going, but one step at a time.

Q. Who is checking on CITI?

A. The SOTS is responsible for checking their information. If you want to verify the classes you have taken with ROVAC, you will be able to check with Todd and Chris. The hope is that will be on our website soon along with all the other changes to our website to make things more transparent and open to everybody.

Q. So what if the SOTS wants to pursue Registrars who have not attended classes? We have these yearly mandates for so many hours - who is keeping track of this?

A. ROVAC has the barcode system used at conferences recording classes attended. This information is going over to CITI/UConn. CITI is responsible for keeping track of who is taking classes.

Q. I believe a message needs to go out to Town Committees informing them that the Registrars have to provide this training. They think this is a patronage job. It is not, maybe 30 years ago, not anymore.

A. The Technology Committee, because of cyber security and all these other issues, are looking at our job as being more technical. We need to educate communities that Registrars must be competent to learn all of this new technology. At our meeting last month this was brought up by Peggy Reeves. The SOTS needs to advertise how important this job is, you need to know more technology, and take lots of training. We need to answer concerns about their salaries and hours to be adequate to meet their new requirements.

Most Registrars were very pleased with the Spring conference. There were a few complaints regarding the audio, and/or no copy of slides for their class. There was one presentation where many were wondering what was being talked about. The request is for giving us something to follow, but some speakers/instructors do not like people studying papers while they are presenting. It is advantageous to have the print out of the slides so that we have a place to put our notes. In the case of SOTS, they have our addresses, so it should be easy for them to email this to us. Then we have the choice to make a copy or not.

Q. We noticed that some of the food was cold, when we finally got our turn.

A. The food was delicious.

Q. We want to thank the committee members for helping those who have trouble getting their food. It is really appreciated.

Credentials Committee by Anita Mips. No report.

**Education Committee** Report by Sharon Krawiecki. The committee worked very hard on the conference and hope everyone was pleased. We hear that you want the presentations before the conference, but some of the presenters are simply unwilling to give them out to the conference committee to send them out. We will work on that for next time.

Q. Have you gotten any feedback about the cost of the conference? We do a three-day conference in the Spring, that is a lot of money. We added it up and made a hard-fiscal decision to skip this conference, as it was over \$1000, when you add it all up. (We are paid by the hour.) Is there any discussion of limiting the conference to one or two days?

A. We have, as a county, recommended this to the board in the past. We were overruled by the majority on the Executive Board, they like the three days. We can bring it up again. There reason is that the time needed for the annual meeting is unknown and could be long, especially if there is a bylaws issue. Some of them we can get through pretty quickly, but there are years where we have Elections of officers. Last time we had to call an additional special meeting to finish it.

Q. But we do not have an Election every year. Why not go to a two day conference when there are no Elections?

A. The bylaws could be a subject any year. They can take a long time to resolve.

Q. We are in Danbury this fall, which is a tough location to drive to for most of the state. Could we try to get a more central location for the fall conference? There are new buildings, there might be new options.

A. The conference committee looks everywhere and researches any suggestions.

Q. Isn't the fall conference less attended than the spring, perhaps because of the location?

A. No, both conferences this past year had over 300 attendees. It is wonderful to have that participation level. Everyone knows if they attend both conferences, they will get their 8 hours of required training in the two conferences, so our numbers are up. This limits where we can go, because we must accommodate such a large group.

Q. So, we can discuss changing the Spring conference to go from three days to two at the Executive Board meeting?

A. I will put it on the agenda for July, because Chris needs to make a booking decision and the deposit needs to be put in soon.

Q. Could we start looking at conference spaces that are not inside of a hotel? Instead choose a conference space that has hotels you can walk to. A lot of towns are no longer paying for the Registrars to stay overnight. Some of the Registrars get very little pay.

A. We can pass the suggestion to the conference committee.

Q. Has anything come of that study on Registrar salary that the state was doing? Has anyone seen any reports? It came from Peggy months ago.

A. Only select towns were asked about salary, not all towns. No reports yet.

Q. Sharon and Kevin did a video on their public access channel that is great, where high school students get to see what is involved before the public goes to the polls.

A. The Mayor of Bristol brings out a group of students before every council meeting to visit a different department, and this was our turn. Nutmeg TV came in and filmed it, and we went through the entire process of ballot testing. We had the kids fill out the receipts and the certifications. It was not just going to the polls, it was all the background work that we have to do. Even our mayor was impressed with how much work was involved, all the technology.

**Legislative Committee** Report by Pete Gostin and Lisbeth Becker. Quick bullet points for legislation, for most things we have discussed, nothing happened. That is a good thing. We had three ROVAC bills: unknown

votes renamed as unassigned, a change in the terminology; petition clarification on the number of signatures required, specify when the percentage will be calculated; and post-election SOTS random audits timeframe to move forward, 7 days or less, so that we would have more time to prepare for the audits; SOTS online directory for easier lookup of answers to questions; technical cleanup, including to clarify 8, not 10 hours of training to maintain certification. All of those went down the tubes. Two of our three bills made it out of committee, but nothing advanced beyond that. Other bills, that we were tracking, from the GAE, were the pop-up polling places for college towns. It would require every town with a college or university to create a polling place for federal elections only, which did make it out of GAE committee along partisan lines but was defeated in the house. The bathroom bill, which would allow party workers, or anybody, to use the bathrooms in a polling place within the 75 foot, that also passed out of the GAE committee 17 to 0 but ran out of time in the House and it did not get taken up. There was a bill to extend the hours of EDR to 9:00 pm, went out of committee 9 to 8, along party lines, but did not come up for a vote in the Senate. Another bill was primary day EDR, that too went out of GAE committee 9 to 8, party lines again, but that was not taken up by the House. Another one that did get passed was the moderator of an EDR location when the Registrars can't agree, the Town Clerk would make the decision, it passed both houses - but the Governor just vetoed it. He claimed that the Town Clerk would not be impartial arbiter and said it should go to the legislative body of the town. An early voting bill died in the Senate, so now 2022 is the earliest that anything can get put on the ballot for a Constitutional Amendment. The location of absentee central counting when the Registrars can't reach a decision, bill passed unanimously out of GAE, passed both the house and senate, and is awaiting the Governor's signature.

For the coming year, we expect we will be under more scrutiny and EDR will be a focus. Towns that were short on EDR staffing, need to consider beefing up their staffing, as we will be under a microscope again this year. This was the reason for the bill to extend EDR hours. Some towns were short staffed, and they had long lines. Please do everything you can to make this a smooth process. Try to have the line down to only a few at 8:00 pm. We are also for this year considering a revamping of ROVAC day at the state capitol, we are getting tired of the ice cream social. So, we anticipate the Legislative Committee and the ROVAC Board will get together to discuss other options.

There were some issues with these bills that we expect to come back this year. The bathroom bill will come back, as there are some issues there. One of them was a presumption that poll workers would recognize the candidates, they are a known face. Election workers, if they remove their candidate paraphernalia, can go in to use the bathroom. The issue is not all polling locations are laid out the same, and for those polling locations where the bathrooms are physically located where the balloting is done. The current statute does not allow other people to go into the location or loiter for any other purpose than voting. The problem was in creating exceptions to this rule and deciding on what needs to be in statute. Creating the list of exceptions for candidates would be complicated

Q. There was an article in the paper last week about a reprimand to a candidate for using the bathroom at a polling place after a complaint was filed. The candidate was lingering when he used the bathroom. But what was interesting is that the candidate threw the moderator under the bus, by saying that nobody said anything to him and they had no idea that they were not supposed to use the bathroom.

A. Yes, the moderators oversee the polling place and it is their duty to supervise their polling place. Patrolling the hallways within the 75 ft periodically needs to be done, and they need to ensure that the 75 ft restrictions are be upheld. So, one of the discussions was that the moderator should have the discretion to decide about using the bathroom. Why would you want to put our moderators in this position? They have other things to do. We expect this to come up again this year.

We will be continuing to push the issues that we wanted to pass, in terms of the clean ups and clarifications, the trainings and petitions, unassigned voters - but generally speaking we are concentrating on the amount of harm that these other bills proposed would have given us. The difficulties these other bills over shadowed the bills we wanted to pass. When a lot of stuff did not pass, we were relieved, our thought was first and foremost, do no harm. We live to fight another day for our stuff. There is certainly going to be a new General Assembly next year and a new Governor, we will see what happens and what bills make it out of the GAE committee and what gets proposed. We anticipate tracking a lot of stuff. We have been warned that there may be a new audit bill, because the current 5% is not adequate. We might go back to ten due to concerns about cyber security.

Q. What about these towns that always get picked and then others that never have to do an audit? The same towns get picked repeatedly. There are some towns that don't know how to run one. Why are some towns picked every single time?

A. Some large towns have more polling places which means a greater chance of being pulled in the drawing.

Q. Our town is not picked very often, and I do not want one. Another issue is that some towns have fewer polling places because their polling places are very large. Our town has 7000 voters at one polling place, so when we get picked, we are doing a major audit. We have only been audited twice, but it is a lottery to determine the now, 5%.

Q. But when you have more polling places you are making it easier for the voter to get to their polling place. You do not want to disenfranchise anybody. Regarding the bathroom issue, election enforcement doesn't do anything about candidates using the bathroom now.

A. Yes, they just did, they issued the reprimand that was handed out to a State Senator last week. It was filed by the other candidate in that race, who felt it was unfair, if they are not allowed in the polling place, to allow the use of the bathroom.

Q. In Newington, when one of the candidates went into the EDR location, one of the pollworkers reported it. He got a letter back from Elections Enforcement that said that this is not a problem because EDR is not a polling place. He was on the ballot. He refused to leave when the Moderator asked him to leave. He was talking to everybody and there were lines.

A. So, there is some question on that, since we are supposed to make our EDR sites as close to a polling site as possible. It is our understanding that the 75-foot rule applies to an EDR location.

Q. Well, it didn't count in this case. We were told that EDR is not a polling place.

A. We need to relook at the statutes, to clarify this. But we also have the option to discuss this with our Town Committees when we meet monthly. Before each Election, you need to give a report, where hopefully all the candidates will be present, and tell them the rules. Make sure they know they cannot be in a polling place, walking around. Do not talk to the Brownies who are selling cookies - you are a candidate. You need to respect the 75-foot line and use the bathroom appropriately. Communication is key.

Thank you so much for all the work you do, for the tremendous amount of your personal time that you give for us. The state is impressed with the work that you do, the legislature respects us, and the Registrars are at a higher level than they were years ago. They respect us and listen to us. That is a big thing, thank you. Melissa Russell, Sue Larson, and Tim Decaro, all three meet with the legislators, with the GAE chairs and they spend even more inordinate amount of time on our behalf.

**Technology Committee** by Lisbeth Becker and Ann Kilby. Our minutes are posted on the ROVAC website five days after our meetings and they have detailed information. Our last meeting of the technology committee was May 31st, with Ted Bromley and Peggy Reeves and our first topic was cyber security. CVRS is going to require new passwords that are more elaborate and changed every 90 days. There is going to be some online training on cybersecurity that will be required. The plan is to move CVRS to a SOTS platform by November - so it will no longer matter what operating system you are on, it will be controlled by the SOTS platform. Currently the plan is to get this information out through the Town Clerks, because not all towns have Registrars of Voters. If you know of towns that aren't at these meetings, please have them contact us (Lisbeth and Anne) for more information. We need everyone to understand what the process is going to be, this is important, it is the crux of the SOTS cybersecurity efforts. Everyone is going to be working on a virtual station, and it won't matter what your computer is. In some towns several people use the same computer, and the goal is to silo CVRS, so that this doesn't matter.

Q. Will Registrars need to contact their IT people?

- A. No, the SOTS is contacting Town Clerks and the clerks will identify who performs their IT for each town. Some towns have their own IT departments, some use outside consultants or their financial administration. The goal is to make sure that someone from IT is identified in each town for the SOTS office to interface with. They will be sending out information of situations, such as hacking, that every IT department needs to be monitoring. This will be a communication tool between you, your IT and the SOTS office. They need someone with technical expertise to communicate with. This information is offered to Registrars, we were given the opportunity to directly subscribe to the email updates at our last conference, but it is an overwhelming amount of highly technical information constantly being sent, up to 50 per day. A lot of sifting to figure out what is relevant. ROVAC has requested that the SOTS send essential information directly to all the Registrars, perhaps in their newsletters, rather than expect us to go through all of the technical emails.

We are happy to report that now when you print voter registration cards in CVRS, you no longer have the half page of instructions. We are currently testing the ability of the system to automatically move to inactive status those who did not reply to a canvass CVR letter in 31 days after your canvass letter was sent. Right now, you have to do this manually, one at a time. So, one of the issues is that some towns prefer to wait longer, say 60 days, because so many of the returns do not make the 30 day deadline. By making the process of no reply to inactive automatic, there may be some unnecessary additional work to reverse, back to active, for the late replies.

Q. We find that most of those who don't reply will stay inactive, or go off, and don't get moved back to active.

- A. Please let us know if you have an issue with this, this is still being tested, we need to know if it doesn't help you.

Q. If we are concerned about hackers, why are all our emails displayed on every email that is sent by the SOTS?

- A. On our cybersecurity team at ROVAC, we came up with different issues, and this was one of them. Years back the SOTS provided Registrars with consistent town email addresses - now we all have different emails. We have suggested email be sent BCC, so that you will not get the whole list.

At a special meeting on May 17th, Sue presented a list of our recommendations to all the different players in this, including some members of the GAE committee. We came up with minimum standards for emails and minimum standards for CVRS. That is why the CVRS logins and passwords are being strengthened right now. We asked for audit trails to track deletions of voter records and any voter election history changes. We may need to remove the option to upload who voted, because we are concerned that the sub drive could have a

virus that would allow hacking of CVRS. The problem with this is that some towns are using electronic pollbooks to capture the who voted list, and the ability to upload, rather than manually enter all that information is one of their best features. We need to ensure that if information is uploaded from any outside source of data, there is no hacking going on. The ROVAC board had asked the SOTS to decide about electronic pollbooks, and we are hoping that will happen.

The other issue we discussed is that using a single vendor for our voting machines, maintenance of the machines and memory coding, leaves us more vulnerable. If we had another vendor, we wouldn't have all our eggs in one basket. We just had a phishing attack, and we asked how to educate Registrars about this issue. A phishing email came out of New Haven and someone who got it, sent it to the SOTS, so they took care of it. One of our concerns and focus is on educating all Registrars of Voters on how to recognize a phishing attack and to never open suspicious emails.

Another issue discussed was online voter registration, to integrate it with the voter lookup so that if you are already registered you can see your own information. The voter can see if there is a need for a correction, or if they are all set. Many towns are getting online requests, when no changes are being made.

We also asked for some DMV changes. Right now, we have some unofficial discussion of changes needed. The DMV is in the midst of their Phase 2 update of their system. The next phase will be implemented in August 2019, so in between now and then, we will continue to meet and discuss what is changing/needed. The most important change is that the DMV customer will be entering their own information, as opposed to the DMV clerk. The manual entry by the DMV clerks is the source of many typos, wrong streets or towns. The idea for the change is that the voter will have a lookup screen, so they can review and correct their information directly. This change involves all new hardware and software. Their big limitation is that the field for addresses is not big enough to put a full address.

In tumbleweed we need to do some outreach to towns that do not come in regularly, once a month is no longer reasonable. The old towns need to move the voter off before the new town can receive the new registration. We have an obligation to not strand that voter registration. DMV changes cannot be ignored, you need to at a minimum click the no action required, so the town that they moved to can receive that information. The lists of changes should not wait a month to be implemented, especially when we are up against deadlines for party changes. By law you must process these voters in ten days, but some towns are still on a once a month schedule.

Q. But this is new, originally Ted had said those deadlines to process start upon receipt. If you came in once a week or once a month, that is okay, the clock started with when you came in. We need to tell all the Registrars that this has changed, it is no longer true, now the clock starts when the voter registered at the DMV.

A. We are working on this with the SOTS to get the word out.

Stress test for this Election is today between 1 and 2 pm. Everyone must be in your office this afternoon and we need everyone to do an Official Voter List at the same time to test the CVRS system. You do not need to print it, we just need you to generate it. The SOTS on the day of an Election or Primary changes the amount of resources available to CVRS, and to gauge how much more power we need to keep the system running smoothly. Be sure to change your password before 1:00 pm, because that can take some time to do, and will impact our stress test. We are getting lots of cooperation from the SOTS and Tom Miano, is helping us with this. There will be a technology conference call to go over how this goes. This is not an opportunity to discuss other, everyday issues, such as a missing voter. The focus is on determining if the system can handle the volume as everyone generates a voter list. We are gauging system performance. We need to know if you get

a blank screen, can't log in, running super slow or have a frozen screen. Please send us, the ROVAC technology committee whatever issues you have in generating a voter list. Sue Larsen sent out the addresses to send your reports to, and your Town Clerk can send to those addresses as well if they are participating.

One more note, we had been asking for over a year to not have all the voter registration instructions print out as you create a voter registration card for online voters. It was a lot of wasted ink, plus if you are printing on card stock of 5 x 8, it was a waste. We did come up with a way to do this, but if you find your printing is not working - the form isn't spaced correctly, let us know. Please send it to the tech committee contacts too. Some have reported their top line of the form, where you check the boxes with the type of change was getting cut off. That is a software setup - perimeter setting issue. Let us know, so that we can present the SOTS if more changes need to be made.

Q. We tried to resolve that the line A is still being cut off when we print, spent four hours with Steve Mason and our IT, and could not resolve it.

A. Okay send that to our IT committee and give us some time to consolidate this information.

Q. One possible solution, our IT, suggested you set the pdf print current view setting to 90%. With that small reduction in size, the topline is no longer cut off. Unfortunately, the bottom line was slightly cutoff, but I would rather have the bottom line cut off rather than the top.

A. Please send your fixes to the technology committee and let us know if it is continuing to work, or if you have any problems.

Q. We have been able to order 5 x 8 cardstock with lines on the back from a member of our technology committee. This was a very affordable way for us to get cardstock paper.

A. We found getting standard 8.5 x 11 cardstock paper is much cheaper. We get it from Staples.

Q. Our town has had some trouble with CVRS connections, regarding the stress test. Just for today, should everyone be using Internet Explorer when going into CVRS? Or can we use Firefox or Chrome?

A. Chrome has issues with the popup functions, especially during canvass. Chrome has some issues with CVRS. To save a file, the dialog box does not come up. In November, with their new applications, the bandwidth is a concern.

Q. Is the move to the cloud going to happen before the November Election?

A. Yes, they are hoping to test it during a stress test before the November Election. That is not in stone, but we will know if they make the change. Again, there is no change in the CVRS on your end, just the platform where it happens. Their goal is by November, and you might have to download an icon for your desktop to connect to it. They want to be able to, going forward, make changes smoothly, on a single platform. Currently it matters what version of, for example, XP, that your town is using.

Q. Is the stress test today going to be taking in to account that we will be using more computers for the Election?

A. Yes, they will take resources normally allocated to other areas to ensure CVRS is running smoothly. Two years ago, when we did this, half the towns could not log in. But there is also the issue of EDR and some towns are using the Online Voter Registration to process EDR voters. They are trying to ensure that there is enough power to allow access to that.

Thank you very much for all that information!

**Handbook Committee** Report by Darlene Burrell. No Report - last changes were made before the last Conference.

Enfield has extra ballot boxes that they are willing to give out, call them if you need one. They have four available.

**Nominating Committee** - Charlie was absent. Peter Gostin made a motion to consider nominations after the technology committee report. Seconded by Marie Fox and passed unanimously.

Nominations for our county officers: Chair, Vice-chair, Treasurer and Secretary were requested. No new nominations were proposed. Current officers were nominated as a slate and unanimously approved. Nominations for County Representatives for ROVAC Committees were requested. No new nominations were proposed. Current committee members were nominated as a slate and unanimously approved.

Motion to adjourn by Sue Burnham. Seconded by Peter Gostin. Motion is approved unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 11:27 am.