

*****DISCLAIMER*****

THE FOLLOWING IS AN UNEDITED DRAFT TRANSLATION. THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE VERBATIM, HAS NOT BEEN PROOFREAD AND MAY CONTAIN ERRORS. PLEASE CHECK WITH THE SPEAKER(S) FOR ANY CLARIFICATION.

THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE COPIED OR DISSEMINATED UNLESS YOU OBTAIN WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM THE OFFICE OR SERVICE DEPARTMENT THAT IS PROVIDING CART CAPTIONING TO YOU.

THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE USED IN A COURT OF LAW. -MB

*****DISCLAIMER*****

>>SPEAKER: We will give about one more minute. I want to make sure everybody is in the room, thank you.

Okay, we will go ahead and get started. Good morning, everyone. I see in this room a group of the most passionate, intelligent, most ethical guardians of democracy in our country and we can all be very proud of that and I am proud of what we went there in 2024. We conducted an incredible 2024 presidential election and did it very very well. And so thank you all. Let's give our own selves a round of applause for that.

I am Dag Robinson, I am honored to be here as the standards Board chair.

>>SPEAKER: I would like to ask everybody to stand and rise and join in the Pledge of Allegiance.

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Well, thank you and thank you for joining us here in Charlotte over the next couple of days for this year's annual standards Board meeting. I see a lot of familiar faces and some new faces. This is such an exciting board. It is the only place that I know where representatives of all 55 states and territories get together and talk about election administration. And so it is always something that we look forward to every year.

Administering elections has gotten even more challenging since the enactment of the help America vote act over 20 years ago now. Not only has there been a myriad of developments in technology and security, but election administration as a job has evolved and it is a thank you to

you and your teams that elections have been able to run smoothly despite limited funding and resources at hand. Even with the challenging environment and heightened scrutiny we see how election officials across the country come together and find common ground and help each other and ultimately to be able to serve their voters. At the EAC we are doing our best to navigate these changes to make sure we can fulfill the agency's mission to help you improve the administration of elections and help Americans participate in the voting process.

That is why meetings like this are so important. Significant changes at the local, state and federal level have transformed the election space and most recently have added a lot of uncertainty about what will happen going forward. As members of the standards Board, you all are ambassadors and advocates for your jurisdictions and states not only to the EAC, but also to the other members of the board. These meetings are critical not just so the EAC can hear from you, but also you can hear from each other.

Thank you also to those of you who were able to attend yesterday and join us for the ideas lab session. As many of you have already seen in the agenda you will also be hearing later from a few of the board members who won the 2024 clearinghouse awards, but we are also excited to have other Cleary winners with us here today. This was especially a repetitive year because of the great work you are doing, but we have 53 winners, 44 honorable mentions out of a record number of 258 entries. That is really amazing. We'd love to see that number continue to grow. Not only because we like to recognize the great work of election administrators, but all of those entries are great ideas and even the ones that did not win may be the ones that could help your state or jurisdiction tackle the challenges that you see in front of you.

There is certainly no shortage of things to discuss over the next few days and we thank you for taking the time to be here as we navigate these changes together. And with that I will turn it over to Commissioner Palmer.

>>DONALD PALMER: Thank you Commissioner Hovland and I want to say thank you to all of the states and territories that are attending the standards Board's conference. And one of the first words you heard was my thankfulness to you in the 2024 election cycle. It is always difficult, but it was a tough grind and you all came through on the other end making us all proud of our democracy. I want to thank you that you are flexible and able to provide us comments on issues. This is a really great opportunity for us to hear from you.

The work as Commissioner Hovland said, we continue to see challenges in the election community and we are here to assist and provide whatever we can for the election community across the country. And that really is our charge.

So, we hope to be forward leaning in what we are doing. We continue and you will hear a little bit about our testing certification and the VVSG and some of the efforts our team is making with that. And I want to say thank you to the EAC staff in developing that and putting that together. A number of you will be on panels and we will have that discussion, but it will be the most fruitful if you engage with the panels and with each other during the next day and a half or two days. And so with that I will turn it over to Commissioner McCormick. - Commissioner Hicks.

>>THOMAS HICKS: Thank you Chairman Palmer. I want to say thank you for all of your hard work and dedication to ensure that the primary and general elections ran smoothly. It was not and has never been especially with the heightened scrutiny that we have been receiving from public and we know that the work never stops and we say thank you for taking the time to join us here in Charlotte for this year's annual standards Board meeting. As you prepare for the federal elections in 25/26 and 27.

With your teams taking stock of lessons learned from the last election we want to hear from you about how the EAC can best assist you. Whether it is during this board meeting or finding a staff member or one of the four commissioners here today. Last year the agency reached some new milestones and rolled out some very exciting new product. The learning lab platform came online with 12 training modules and now includes 25 trainings and counting. And so far this year our subject matter experts have trained over 1100 election officials in person.

The clearinghouse community now has over 1000 members from all 50 states. The election support technology evaluation program, ESTEP, launched a program that we saw our first poll book certified. And it ran completed its first site visits across the country and we released the TTX - sorry I thought you were telling me something - I was like stop, Tom! I thought you were giving me signals. We released a TTX card deck to help you plan for contingencies which we have been excited about, very excited about. And there are several here for you to take with you as you go home or you can request more. And that card deck as most of you may not know came from an idea from somebody just like you, an election official. Coming to the EAC and saying hey, why don't you put together some sort of contingency planning for you to think about when we have our downtime sort of thing.

But, there is always more that can be done. We want to hear from you about what other resources or issues we can respond to. And we know there is a lot of uncertainty right now and a lot to discuss and we look forward to having frank discussions moving forward.

So, with that being said, if you have issues, unto the four of us. Do not try to yell at staff, the four of us are the presidential appointees up here. And if there is an issue that needs to be raised, bring it to us.

Now I will turn this over to Commissioner McCormick for her opening remarks.

>>CHRISTY McCORMICK: Thank you Mr. vice chair and thank you for all of your continued work to run our nation's elections and also to your families, because I know that this is hard on them, as well and your loved ones. This is a big lift as we all know.

And while others think this is a off year, a off year (CHUCKLE) we know that is not true and we are always preparing for the next election and I would like to give a special shout out to Virginia and New Jersey for jumping from a presidential election now into a gubernatorial election and then also to Florida for having federal elections five months after federal election.

So, thank you for all that you do. You know as we navigate the executive order that has come out and issues like federal funding, meetings like this are extremely important. We are working on our response and we appreciate your feedback. We will work in good faith to respond the best way possible on behalf of our stakeholders and to follow the law. We know that there is a lot of unknowns and uncertainties at this time, but as long as we are here, we will support election officials to do their jobs the best way they can. And I look forward to our discussions over the next couple of days and hearing from you and your thoughts. Thank you for being here. I know that taking some time out of your schedule is often hard, but we really do appreciate it and thank you for sharing your advice with us. And I will turn it back over to the standards Board chair, Dag Robinson.

>>DAG ROBINSON: Thank you commissioners for your words. And now I will accept a report from the proxy committee if I could have the Honorable Justin Roebuck.

>>JUSTIN ROEBUCK: We have reviewed the eligibility of four proxy designations and I think we will see those appear on the screen. And that is our report.

>>DAG ROBINSON: Thank you, Justin. Without objection these proxies are accepted. As a reminder proxy voting is allowed for all business matters. I would like to turn the meeting over to vice chair Maria Pangelinan for the roll call.

>>MARIA PANGELINAN: I will call by state.

Laurie Scholz Hall. Wes Allen. Michaela Thompson. Carol Beecher. Tonya Tindell. Alexandria Manning Ewing. Coal Jester. Dean Logan. NaKisha Robinson. Rene Warner. Dwight Shellman. Mary Burns. Gabe Rosenberg. Ralph Leary. Laloifi Saelua. Sinatagimaiava To. Anthony Albence. Monica Evans. Paul Lux. Maria Matthews. Bradford Raffensperger. Christiana Ramirez. Rex K. Christine Yuetta. Patty Weeks. Daniel Lee. Charles Holiday. Erica Cristal. Nicole Brown. Bradley King. Amanda Harlan. Eric Grogan. Jamison Shu. Brian Caskey. Gregory McNeil. Mike Spence. Elizabeth Stigall. Jeff Hancock. Wendy Roski. Shanna Bellows. Guy M. Katherine Berry. Andrew Dowd. Deborah O'Malley. Justin Roebuck. Jocelyn Benson. Michael Stalberger. Paul Linnell. Robert Coleman. Kyle Kirkpatrick. Sarah Zürich. Kristi Peters. Lexus Doctor. Austin James. Brian Cruz. Andrew Buehler. Kammi R. Francisco angular. Robert D. Patricia P. S Thompson. Donna Barber. Annie H. Courtney S. Thomas Connolly. Kim Susie. Erica J. Erica White. Ms. Burnett. Blair Gonzales. Carol M. Darren Johnson.

>>SPEAKER: Present, sorry.

>>MARIA PANGELINAN: Norma F Morales. Nick Lima. Kathy P. John B. Howard Crum. Rachel S. Page Dennis. Mark Goins. Laura Rogers. Christina Adkins. Lannie Chapman. Shelley Jackson. Sandra P. Terrel Alexandre. Caroline Fox. Mark K. Susan Beals. Lori Larson. Stuart Holmes. Brian Wood. Britney Westfall. Lori Stoller. Anna Berube. Kayla White. Chuck Gray. Mr. chair, we have quorum.

>>SPEAKER: Funny, I hear Derrin and I think of my wife and she says I don't answer to that either! I now I will go through the oath of office.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Dag. If members could stand and raise their right hand, repeat after me.

I do solemnly swear or affirm that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic. That I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same. That I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter so help me God.

Thank you. I will turn it back to you, Dag.

>>DAG ROBINSON: Thank you, Commissioner. I would like to direct the membership to the agenda that they received and check that it is an available meeting and the meeting minutes folder and call for a motion to approve the agenda. I entertain a motion to move the agenda.

>>SPEAKER: Paul Lux moved.

>>SPEAKER: Brad King second.

>>DAG ROBINSON: It has been moved and seconded. All opposed say nay. All in favor say aye - sorry about the wordsmithing there.

(MULTIPLE SPEAKERS)

aye. Motion is hereby approved. You were sent the 24 annual meeting minutes ahead in an email and I would like to call for a voice vote to approve the meeting minutes from the 2024 meeting. I would entertain a motion. Do we have a second? Thank you. It has been moved and seconded. Any discussion or changes to the minutes? All those in favor for approving the minutes please signify by saying aye. Opposed? There being none, minutes are approved, thank you.

In January of this year, the EAC solicited nominations on behalf of the nominating committee for nine open positions on the executive board. As certified by the nominating committee the number of nominations is equal to the number of open positions that meets the requirements of the help America vote act under article 5 section C of the standards Board bylaws. Candidates may be elected by acclamation if the number of candidates is equal to the number of seats to be elected. As that is the situation here an additional nomination may not be accepted from the floor. I asked for a acclamation that Kathy P, Jeff Hancock, (NAME) Chapman, Maria Pangelinan, Jamison S, -- be elected to the executive board. Would all of those please say aye.

(MULTIPLE SPEAKERS)

aye. Thank you. The nominations have been carried by acclamation according to the bylaws. I would now like to recognize EAC Executive Director Brianna Schletz to provide a EAC agency update.

>>BRIANNA SCHLETZ: Good morning, sorry, shifting chairs a little bit there. Thank you, Dag. My name is Brianna Schletz, EAC Executive Director. It is hard to believe that I started in this role a year ago. But, I but have not protected well last year brought and I want to let all of you know that I'm committed to the mission of EAC. I continue to be committed to helping election officials improve the administration of elections and helping Americans participate in the voting process. I am honored to partner with election officials and each of you as board members in advancing safe, secure, accurate and accessible elections.

So, I revisited my notes from last April standard board meeting when I was four weeks into the job and very excited and not quite I think sure what I was walking into, but I just want to

reinforce that I continue to be inspired by the exceptional leadership of our commissioners and the work of our professional hard-working staff.

Last year I described my hope of offering staff stability and focusing on two main areas. One, improving internal structures and improving policies and procedures that we need in place and then two, stakeholder collaboration. For me, that was ensuring that we are meeting customer needs and getting everything we can out of meetings like this and that we were improving our federal coordination efforts.

So, I would like to share some of the success that we have had in the last year in those areas. I just want to say that I'm incredibly pleased with the work that the EAC has done. We have incremented our new organizational chart, improved policies and really invested in partnerships. In fiscal year 24 the EAC reorganized its divisions into five central offices. This was in an effort to be more functionally aligned, efficient, responsive, scalable and capable of accomplishing the agency's mandate. So, we now have the office of General Counsel led by Camden who you will hear from in a little bit in our chief election technology office led by John Panick that I see at the back of the room. Our chief election office led by Kammi Foote making sure that this meeting runs smoothly and our chief financial office led by Tim Lamping and chief information office led by Jessica Bowers. And this organization has allowed us to break down silos and cross train staff to be more effective as an agency.

In addition to the reorganization we fill key positions and currently we are operating with a staff of 78. Our headquarters are located in Washington, DC, but we also have staff in 23 states and all regions of the country. We have seen and heard the many ways that having that geographic spread has improved the connections and election administrators understanding different processes and then also understanding different perspectives.

More strategically I would like to also mention last summer we work together as an agency identify our three core values. Honesty, trust and customer service. These are shared values are important, because they are our why and they guide us in our decisions and behavior.

Shifting gears a little bit for accountability in this year's annual financial report we outlined progress on indicators towards achieving strategic goals for the first time in many years we put recommendations in our EAC annual report and we have also taken steps to issue updated policies and automation throughout the commission to be more efficient and we have also invested in systems for example our grants class system increase timely reporting from 76% in 2022 to 93% in 2024.

Finally, our leadership team is currently establishing new strategic goals and indicators in order to track progress towards our agency priorities and making sure that we are staying on track. Shifting gears a little bit to stakeholder collaboration.

First I just want to say thank you to each of you for being here. Thank you for providing input and participating in my hope is that we can continue to learn from each of you and make our products more valuable and impactful for the election community.

One of the things that we have continued to do is focused on customizable toolkits and more of those are coming and so you will hear about that. But, I would also like to highlight some examples from last year that have come as direct request from you. Commissioner Hicks highlighted the TTX cards, but there are more examples and I will run through a couple of them. Following the request from the last FACA board meeting, we followed the APA recommendation to help election officials manage workplace stress with one specifically designed for poll worker training.

Around 2024 and after, the EAC has made an effort to share information directly from state and local jurisdictions across social media platforms here that was in a effort to amplify your voices and again at your request. Also by request we've updated and streamlined an older election security video. We made it shorter and customizable for states. Research has indicated that that video increased voter confidence by offering transparency around the process making it helpful for both election officials and voters. Furthermore, research showed that when the videos and election information were customized with state and local information, they were even more successful at increasing voter confidence.

Also related to collaboration I'm very excited to talk a little bit more about our field services program. In 2024 EAC launch of the quality monitoring program. This was long needed to ensure the integrity and strengthen the oversight of field and certified voting system. Our field service team goes on-site to work with state and local officials on post-certification quality monitoring.

Much of this has been through the industry standard practice of software hash validation. Which is essentially when a deployed system software matches ensuring that it matches the software certified by the EAC or the golden hash. Our team has addressed 54 hash validation request and also successfully completed and piloted projects one in Hawaii and one in Nebraska where those reports are online. We have also provided briefings the 43 states and territories. We held a hearing earlier this year in order to discuss the results of those initial engagements and try to find ways that we can approve the program. We have also had the clearinghouse team and field services team collaborate on a hash validation training that is available in the learning lab so anybody can access that and learn more about hash validation and you will hear more about the learning lab later in the day. And I would be happy to share information on how you can connect with the field services team if anybody is interested.

We are continuing to listen to your needs and dedicate resources to improving election administration, but in 2024 we also focused heavily on partnerships. In addition to hosting a public hearing that spotlighted federal coordination on 2024 elections, the EAC has also worked diligently to try to improve collaboration with both NASED and NASS. And last year we heard concerns regarding Postal Service and gracefully connected the postmaster general with

commissioners to share concerns and offer potential opportunities for solutions including voter education on mailing deadlines and we offered to partner on training resources and other initiatives.

Finally, on collaboration EAC continued partnership with GSA to support and improve vote.gov which provides state specific information on registering to vote. We currently have a GSA employee that is detailed to the TTX help with transitioning operations of vote.gov from their agency to ours.

Our goal is to expand that in order to make the website more comprehensive and have more information for voters with voting and registration information in one spot. The EAC is also looking forward to national poll worker day on August 12 and so mark your calendars for that. And we also look forward to a new toolkit and information coming soon.

I also want to extend my gratitude to each of you and your teams for filling out the Eva survey. I understand that this is cumbersome and time-consuming and we are taking efforts to improve that process that you will hear more about later, but I just want to express my thanks and remind everyone that it is due to Congress on June 30 and we are working diligently in order to meet that deadline.

In closing, I hope that the themes that resonate with you that we are taking steps to continually improve as an agency and we want to help and be a resource for you and we say thank you to everything that you do to run elections. I also want to spend a minute saying that I am incredibly proud of our EAC team. You're going to hear from some of them throughout the remainder of the meeting and while our teams remain small, they are incredibly dedicated to EAC's mission. We are very excited to have our chief technology officer, John Panick and testing and certification Brooke Waters and so definitely take advantage of them being here and I also want to recognize Kim, the ADFO and the executor board meetings that happen all year long, it is a lot of moving pieces and incredibly difficult and so I appreciate her leadership on that. I want to say thank you to our CFO and travel team who have helped with all of the logistics in getting each of you here. Our IT team and William who is making sure that everything runs smoothly. The clearinghouse team in general for just ensuring that the subject matter is relevant and engaging for each of you. And a huge thank you to the communications team, because without their effort, this would not be able to happen. And with that, my last thank you is to each of you, the members and the officers, because your participation and input are what make these meetings successful and help us learn and grow and do better. Thank you so much. With that I believe I am turning it back to Dag.

>>DAG ROBINSON: Thank you, Brianna. And thank you for your work and your staff and what they do for us. It is incredible the amount of work that goes in and we do appreciate that.

So, with that I would like to turn the floor over to Camden Kelliher and the commissioners for discussion on the recent executive order regarding elections.

>>CAMDEN KELLIHER: As everybody is transitioning, this is my fifth year with the FACA which means a lot of you recognized me and understand that before we get to the spice of life

here, there is a couple things on general FACA membership that I would like to go over. And you are just going to have to bear with me on that one real quick.

Generally, this board is governed by federal laws and this is to make you aware of those and I will tell you the highlights. The Federal advisory committee act, the government and sunshine act and freedom of information act and as well as the privacy act.

Me and my team which also, shot out to the team OGC that is here and we don't take that as a slight, Brianna! And really on the back and EAC takes care of these things, but they are a part of the general operations and you should all be aware. Generally, board members duties enter sponsor buildings include participating in these meetings, submitting nonbinding advice and recommendations to the EAC. Members must follow the approved charter which actually for the standards Board was just refilled I believe the date was April 11 and again I am saying something out loud that matters a whole lot to us and may not matter a whole lot to you, but I believe the charter governs the existence of the FACA and the bylaws adopted by the board govern how you will operate.

You must act with integrity and not go as your own personal benefit and to promote yourself, your services or private parties. I said the same thing to the LLC. I do want to make something clear on a question I got following that that was a good question, this does not mean that your existence as a standards board member and not be discussed. A specific question I got that is I go on a podcast and can I say that I am a LLC board member? Yes. It does not mean that you should be sitting in the crowd providing advice on the EAC when your wife works for a certain voting system manufacturer and promoting that directly. So, LinkedIn, podcasts, your statuses, totally fine to share, just not in use to advance personal interests.

This is the biggest one through this drive boring part I am sure what people are here to discuss for the most part, please pay attention to the biggest thing for the EAC and your status as a standards board member is that you cannot lobby Congress in your capacity as a standards board member and so nothing we are going to do here today and nothing you should take away is the EAC asking you to go to federal Congress and lobby on any active laws as a member of the standards board. Now, being a member of the standards board does not prevent you from lobbying Congress on your own, just not in your capacity as a standards board member.

One of the things that I was asked to do today a couple different times throughout the year and some of the executor board meetings and leading up to this was a discussion generally of the federal advisory committees. So, the EAC has four federal advisory committees and three of them were established by HAVA and required by law and those are the technical advisory committees and the standards board, the board of advisors and then the fourth is a discretionary advisory committee that the EAC est., the local leadership Council.

This is shared directly by the director of NIST and are made in conjunction with NIST and includes two members of the standards board, two members of the board of advisors and one from IEEE and one from NASED. Now, everything except the four technical experts, that is

appointed as a representative of the group referenced and the four technical expert positions are sold jointly by the EAC and NIST. The primary response about is to assist the executive director of the voluntary voting system guidelines.

The standards board if you are not already aware is a 55 state election and 55 local election officials appointed by the chief election official of the state overseen by the chief election official of the state and there is a nine-member executive Board and the executive board that you voted by acclamation that you voted on very enthusiastically today is the only executive board for any of the EAC board specifically called out by HAVA and generally these standards boards and I will summarize the last paragraph, this PowerPoint will be made available and it is to provide advice and guidance to the EAC pretty much on every product that the EAC produces as called out by HAVA.

I apologize to the LLC and I apologize to you all for the structure of this slide. I did my undergrad in business school and I was taught to do better than this. But, this is the board of advisors. It is a completely representative group and the board of advisors, the EAC does not make appointments to the board of advisors and does not make selections and I can let you go through that list. But, those are all representative members to the board of advisors and similar to the board of advisors, the board of advisors provides guidance to the EAC on the VVSG as well as studies and reports and a local leadership Council being a discretionary FACA is at the discretion of the LLC on the feedback that they provide and what the EAC requests and they do generally treat it just to get the complete and loan view of the election officials. We found that locals in a group of locals are more comfortable sharing some feedback than they are in conjunction with the state and so it just helps that flow for the implementation.

With that and again, I say this every time, I am more fun in my personal life. That is what we needed to cover some general background information. But, one of the key points of the existence of a federal advisory committee, especially the three board of advisors, VVSG and standard advisory board is that there is a part to play in the VVSG process as defined by HAVA and this is the process that EAC follows and I wanted to lay out a summary of the and this is what the EAC considers applicable law when it comes to the VVSG and that starts with taking into consideration recommendations provided by the TDGC and that is realistically the first step in the EAC six process and that includes modifications to the VVSG and so it is not only the existence, but modifications to the VVSG and starting with recommendations to the TDGC.

The EAC executive director must also submit the guidelines or modifications to the guidelines to this part of advisors and to the standards board and they cannot be adopted unless there has been a 90 day review process by the standards board and board of advisors. Final adoption of any VVSG or modification also requires approval of commission and HAVA requires that it is done with public comment and on public record for that VVSG. So, I went through each one individually and showed you the EAC six provisions and that is primarily what is called out in HAVA when it is coming to the VVSG. Separately the EAC is tasked with these implementation of the voter registration form and there is not a specific callout in the help America vote act for the boards to be involved with the NVRA process instead the NVRA and the EAC and

implementing regulations state that those must be done in consultation with the chief election officers of the states and it is a two part process. There is two separate consultation requirements. The EAC adopted regulations originally when the NVRA regular should were transferred to the SEC and those regular sheets have not been revisited sense. It is specifically required that regulations be updated in consultation with the state chief election officers. The way the EAC originally did not win the authority over the regulation was transferred from the FEC to the EAC was through a general rulemaking process and you can go back and look and the Federal Register is public, but the EAC incorporated that consultation requirement into what was an otherwise required notice of comment rulemaking process. Updates to the regulations do require notice and comment rulemaking process and so if there was an update, the EAC updated a form that required an update to the regulations and the first step in the process would be to update the regulations and that would require minimum a 90 day notice and comment public rulemaking process.

If the form or to be updated under current regulations, the EAC would first need to consult with the state chief election officials. On the contents of that. I do want to note that as we kind of progress and to allow you all to speak in the big topic of the day that the EAC did send a letter to the state chief election officials on April 11 seeking consultation. This is not the same consultation process that is required for an update to the content of the form. The EAC has not yet proposed updates to the content of the form and it is a unique position in that we were directed to change the contents of the form. So, what that consultation letter was seeking was general input on getting to these next steps. And so this is the process. These parts of the process have not yet been fomented to the EAC and additional consultation was sent on April 11.

So, with that and I lost my final slide, there it is. I think the topic that everybody is expected to talk about today and the room is a little bit more full than otherwise typically would be and we have made it through my dry and drab general EAC overview. I'll be sleepy executive order on the implementation or the executive order to protect the integrity of American elections for EO 2148 is subject to litigation and the EAC is a defendant and so what we are not here to talk about and cannot talk about is any legal theories but we are happy to cover the factual backgrounds which include the contents of the executive order as well as actions taken by the EAC to date which includes that April 11 consultation letter to the states.

Primarily we are here to hear your feedback in addition to that as I described that April 11 letter was intended to receive the state chief election officials kind of with first impression the ways to go about next steps and that is the same thing that we want to do here today. You may ask a question if it is a factual clarification question we will be able to answer that. We can answer questions in the way that EAC considers things, but not definitive questions element to that litigation. And just to cover it quickly, I would be surprised if I was tell you something that you don't already know, but just to ease into this conversation, there are a couple direct provisions in the executive order, section 2 primarily requires that the EAC add documentary proof of citizenship to the national mail-in voter form and section A requires the EAC inviting federal funding for states noncompliant with section 2. And I'm sorry section 2 is the documentary proof

of citizenship in the NVRA form and section 4B requires that the EAC update VVSG specifically considering barcode and QR codes. And ensuring that the systems produce voter verifiable paper records and section B also requires that the EAC condition funds for states that do not adopt a definition based on ballot receipt deadline by election day. There are also provisions in the executive order that generally touch on the EAC that are specifically directed at the EAC and so section 4 D update voting systems with FEMA and I do want to note - we have spoken with FEMA about those grants generally and it does seem like they are setting priorities for the upcoming year and we are trying to streamline communications for election officials with FEMA on those grants that I think are a little bit more nuanced than maybe the EAC grants and then section 6 of the executive order also requires the DHS voting systems and vulnerabilities as long as those voting systems maintain their designation as critical infrastructure and ask that DHS to do that in consultation with the EAC.

That is the quick summary of the content. I do want to flag for you all that it is included in your membership folders. And we also solicited public comment to the standards Board unsurprisingly - we got more public comment this time around than what we have typically got before. Public comments are primarily on this topic and have been made available to you in your membership folders and will also be made available following this meeting for public review.

With that I open to comments and questions condition on what we are able to talk about and what I have already talked about and happy to hear from membership kind of on what I have discovered.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Camden this is Stuart from the state of Washington. During our presentation you mentioned consultation letter was not the consultation letter, is that correct?

>>CAMDEN KELLIHER: Yes - the letter very clearly says consultation. The EAC position is not that we were seeking consultation, it is just that we would have to seek consultation for the developing of regulations or for content of the form.

>>SPEAKER: Camden, it is Mandy from New Mexico. Can you share a little bit more about what is expected and kind of the timeline for response of this consultation letter?

>>CAMDEN KELLIHER: Yes, so next Friday was the requested deadline for comments on the original consultation. What the EAC intends to do is the responses to that will be incorporated in it lamenting the next steps of the process. So, I think pretty clearly the first step is going to be consideration updating EAC regulations.

So, in doing that process we will take into consideration general consultation that we have gotten and I do want to know that part of that process will be paying attention to court action and I did the lawyer thing and I am long-winded and Mandy, we have asked the feedback for that and we will incorporate that in the required consultation processes.

>>SPEAKER: This is Commissioner Palmer just regarding timing, we had some discussions in executive board meetings with NASS and NASED and as you saw by the executive timelines in HAVA and a part of the standards Board in the past, the standards Board is going to be a part of that process. Now, what is interesting enough when the TDGC met earlier this year or was it late last year? Earlier this year, there was some discussion about slightly revising 2.0 and 2.1

and I mean really slightly or like negligible, because there are requests for information that had come in occasionally. During the process of 2.0 testing. And there has been a number of those. And so there was a discussion about it and there was not any action taken, but as we move forward there will be a couple of different options that the TDGC consider. For the standards Board we may have additional meetings as we look at the timeline, there may be meetings virtually or in person, probably virtually with any recommendations that may be made by the EAC and TDGC. And we request your flexibility over the next month subject to issues of litigation or just logistics, but as soon as we have those RFI's or those potential options we will provide that the boards and just as we have done in the past there are working groups in discussions about the early ideas and that we can get that information to you in a timely manner so we can keep the training moving as necessary.

>>CAMDEN KELLIHER: And I do want to note that I spoke with Secretary of Wyoming, Secretary Gray, yesterday. Who expressed that attendance at these meetings is important as we go through the process we want to recognize that in person may not always be available, especially as we go through a process that requires feedback in more regular meetings and schedules and so as we go through consideration of that process I want it to be known that we are considering not and are aware of that and want to make sure that attendance is an option and required by law feedback from you all in making sure that that happens in an effective way that allows you to continue day-to-day operations, as well.

>>SPEAKER: Two additional things and I probably should've lead with S and these are sort of my overreaching goals as we proceed with VVSG, this process and as we analyze and leaned forward on the EO is obviously my goal is not to disrupt the testing that is going on. And make that process proceed efficiently. The other thing is that however and wherever we end up in this process, my goal is to provide the least disruption to the states and mitigate any impact on you and your voting systems. There is a lot of work that we are going to have to do at the EAC to figure out and we have options that we can take, but our goal is to have the least disruptions in the states and as we proceed into 2026, 2025 and 2026.

>>SPEAKER: Good morning, Karen from North Carolina and before I ask my question I will welcome y'all to the great state of North Carolina. And for any confusion you may have, Charlotte is not the state capital. I did have a commute like all of you. The state capital is about three hours away and we are a large state. But, we welcome you and are glad to have you in North Carolina and you are in North Carolina, not South Carolina if there is any confusion there! If you are at (NAME), you may be straddling the line! So, welcome and thank you again for coming to our state. My question would be - we are moving forward with a bit of consultation and so I guess it has been determined that as an independent agency there is still action to be taken from the executive order?

>>CAMDEN KELLIHER: Yes, this is and I think it essential to the litigation. So, my response to that would be the EAC has previously filed executive orders. I understand the question and I think that EAC understands your question, but it is central and we are not taking a position at this time.

>>SPEAKER: Jeff Hancock from Kentucky. My question is have we done any type of statement for what type of implementation and what it would look like across the country and to succeed with this presidential order?

>>SPEAKER: So, our team has done some analysis on the voting side of this you know and of course there is interpretations of the EO that I believe gives the EAC some flexibility with this and obviously there are some options and I think there has been some analysis that our team is working on that depending on the interpretation of the certification and that sort of thing, there could be an impact and we can provide that to you. On the citizenship issue, one of the things that I think the consultation is important is that we receive the feedback from you not only on the impact, but sort of the nuanced way that your individual state deals with the issue of citizenship and verification and understanding how different states handle that process. And the impact of the federal form would have on that. And so we say the federal form is not used very often, it is used occasionally and certain circumstances, but in my mind if I am a chief election official, that is the sort of information that I would provide is how would that change impact my state if at all and as the EAC, obviously I think that would be helpful in the type of information that we would want. It is why we send out a consultation letter on this type of thing. So, I hope that answers your question. Those are the two areas that come to my mind.

>>SPEAKER: Shelley, Utah. Our state has some legitimate concerns with the tribal identification on the DPOC and we expressed that to the White House and to the speaker's office and that did not seem to be a priority or a concern. How do you feel like you would address that?

>>SPEAKER: Again, right here I don't think I can give you an answer to that and I just think that would be the type of nuanced issue to try to provide information in a very specific way as possible that it is not the first time I've heard of the issue being a concern, but generally speaking, there may be other states that have a similar issue. And so that is the type of information that I think would be helpful in a consultation process.

>>SPEAKER: And likewise on the certification issue, you know you all have to buy new machines, what does that look like in your state? What kind of resources are you going to need? We know that we don't have any systems through 2.0 just yet. We hope to have one soon, but we would love to hear your feedback on how that is going to affect your state and how you would be able to handle that if we had to move forward with that.

>>PAUL LUX: Paul Lux from Florida and thank you Commissioner McCormick for bringing up the elephant in the room that I was going to mention and that is that we currently have zero system certified in 2.0. Now, for all of my time on the TDGC which admittedly does not go back to the origins, I seem to recall that we moved at the pace of molasses in January at the start and so I'm wondering with the timeline established in the executive order, what the prospects are for adding to the VVSG which will then create 2.1 system which we will then have to go through test assertions etc. and that is going to require the use of the TDGC and meetings of the standards Board to get things to you guys and timeline wise I know Commissioner Palmer mentioned specifically to stay flexible on being able to have extra meetings and I'm on board with that, but as a wholesale Outlook, should there even become a system that is 2.1 certified after we have a 2.1 certification? That will be the only system certified to that standard and they are going to what, ramp up production and provide voting agreement to all 50 states in five territories? While we are embargoing microchips and everything else from all over the place which is not going to make it go faster or smoother. And so I would like to hear your thoughts on how that timeline process is actually going to work when we don't actually have anything to certify to yet.

>>SPEAKER: Paul, I would like to thank you for raising a number of those pragmatic concerns. Those are the realities of the process. I think Camden laid out HAVA and certainly we have a full intent of following that, but your point on manufacturing realities of supply chains etc., they matter, but as Commissioner McCormick highlighted, you know there are pieces of the EO that reference certain pots of money and we also saw that Congress appropriated \$15 million for election security in the most recent appropriation and that is for the whole country. And that is you know that ends up being a couple hundred thousand dollars for each state when originally HAVA was passed some of you may recall with the direction to replace punch card systems and there were billions of dollars associated with that. And so certainly there is also a cost element that is very real in addition to where we are in the certification process.

>>SPEAKER: Mark Owens from Tennessee and I piggyback on my good friend Paul Lux from Florida. Assuming there is no injunctions, what would the status be for the next federal election for QR codes and barcodes regarding certification assuming like I say there is no injunctions and the executive order has to be completed.

>>SPEAKER: Sure - I can just - so, this goes to the broader issue. This issue was addressed during the 2.0 discussions and it is not brand-new to us, right? And so one of the options may be interpreting 2.0, right? And just spilling that out in the VVSG 2.0 as an alternative or addition to the 2.1. You know the 2.1 was discussed because there was a number of RFI's and it really just does not have a huge negative impact, but one option has been to interpret 2.0 on the barcode issue as EO discusses. And as you read the EO, it sort of does not absolutely ban the use of barcodes or marking devices, it absolutely authorizes them for voters with disabilities. And as you know, that is not necessarily a decision that is usually a stay and even local decision at times and you may have all of your systems with accessibility features. And so all of that to say that I think there is a way not to - to basically interpret 2.0 and just spell out more specifically this issue of barcodes so it does not negatively impact 2.0 implementation across the country and at the same time meet the goals of the EO which really are to have the system used primarily for barcodes with disabilities and again, the EAC understands that what the role of the VVSG is, particularly the first letter, voluntary, and having served at the state level with who manages that decision on what system can be used with and without a disability and sometimes that is different across the country. And I hope that answers your question as there may be a way to do this as we interpret 2.0 and make that known to the manufacturer's and try to minimize any sort of timeline impact on 2.0.

>>SPEAKER: May I add a couple quick things that I think are useful for this conversation? A couple flags, just one the executive order talks about barcodes that contain votes and so not barcodes that are related to whether it is security or ballot style or other sort of administrative functionality that we sometimes see and so there is that distinction and I also think it is useful and I know for some folks it has been a little while since we have had a 2.0 refresher where we had as chairman Palmer note a topic of conversation in the 2.0 process and where the 2.0 standard landed on that was that if a barcode was used to contain any voter intent that that also had to have a human readable component and had to be open source so that it could be very easily audited. And so again I think that that was something certainly contemplated again as Commissioner Palmer notes there are exceptions for accessibility and so again just a number of factors when thinking about how that may impact various systems.

>>SPEAKER: I will just add to that and I am not aware of any of the status -- test. I think that is up to the voter to decide and that is something for you to consider, as well.

>>SPEAKER: Tom, from New York. And just to follow up on something Commissioner Palmer said, a two part question, number one I'm assuming the first fee expectation is that it is not going away as far as what that means and the second part of the question and it may be somewhat more for DHS and I believe that you said section 6 was the part I talked about DHS reviewing other electoral systems. And the question that I would think of is to what standard if one standard does not exist and so does the EAC ever develop other technologies possibly for review?

>>SPEAKER: There is nothing in the executive order that takes a where the voluntary part of the VVSG and in our perspective there would need to be a HAVA rewrite for that to happen and I don't think that VVSG is not VVSG. On the second point and so the executive order directs DHS and this is actually a good conversation topic, DHS implements section 6 under the designation of election systems as critical infrastructure. That is wholly separate from our authorities under HAVA and the EAC is not designated under that sector and so while there is strong overlap on the voluntary standards, we produce our manufacturers to build to the critical infrastructures of voluntary programming as well for DHS to interact with estates to review general security systems. So, DHS has developed testing for critical infrastructure in the different sectors that are separate from what the EAC produces through the VVSG and so I independently and I will not make inclusion for DHS although I asked them to do it with inclusion with the EAC that any of section 6 requires that DHS committed and offers what our field services offer and in continuance with the VVSG. It is a separate security standard as critical infrastructure.

>>SPEAKER: This is Mandy again from New Mexico. I just wanted to follow up a little bit on what Paul mentioned in particular about the timing. I think we have had conversations Camden, but I'm supposed to be presenting dangerous board on TDGC and I am not really able to participate and vote because of a long ago. And ultimately there has been difficulties in getting a quorum and recommendations out of the TDGC. What can we expect in reality as far as timing, decertification, what if they do not make a recommendation? A lot of unknowns and what can you speak about the absolute knowns and timelines right now?

>>CAMDEN KELLIHER: The absolute known and timeline is that the process will be followed. There is nothing that deviates from this process. What that timeline looks like is a minimum of 90 days viewing time as well as the commission following that and so what is known is that this process has to be followed. And what comes from that process, I don't think the EAC and I don't want to get into speculation, but it is not just checking the box in the process. We need all four commissioners to agree with the result of that process or at least three commissioners to agree and I don't think we are interested in developing and just going through a 90 day check the box. We want the feedback and we will receive the feedback and we will go through that process. And what we can factually say is that at a minimum it is at this process that starts with the TDGC review and then following receipt of the TDGC, that 90 days process. And I will let the commissioners speak, but we continue to work through NIST on trying to own the appointment process where through the joint appointment process through the TDGC and NIST going 30 the Department of Commerce and we do view it as a EAC advisory committee, but we also want to respect NIST being a part of the and maintaining ownership of

that appointment process when it comes to vetting appointments. That is the only board that we have that that's appointment in that way because it is in partnership with NIST and we are working to get that corrected and I know that we have said that to you before, Mandy, but we are continuing to work on it.

>>SPEAKER: And I will mention that there is a change of leadership at NIST, as well and so that will change things as we move forward.

And they are personally aware of it, too. I have brought up this issue as the acting director and there is no reason for the delays and that being said we are going to follow the VVSG process and we cannot really compress the calendar too much, but for example the 90 day time, we can have a consultation and perhaps a virtual board meeting simultaneously with the board of advisors and standards board. And so pass to cycles we would occasionally do this and the standards board, a couple months later the board of advisors after the TDGC, there are ways to do these actions simultaneously while the public is also commenting and so you save some time on that. In the interest of a good faith attempt to meet the goals of the EO going through the VVSG process going through the statutory requirements in HAVA.

>>SPEAKER: And I just want to add that we are committed to being transparent with you all. We are going to let you all what we can when we know it and tried to be as clear as possible in terms of timeline and keeping aware of the election calendar, as well. I know that we have elections all the time, but that is going to be important for us moving forward in how we handle whatever we have to handle. Clarity is going to be important both from the courts and from Congress, as well. And we are taking all of that into consideration and we have no reason to keep anything from you. We are going to try to make this as open of a process as possible in good faith.

>>SPEAKER: To that point and I know one of the concerns that we heard at LLC was essentially like do you have a flip of a light switch and I think part of why we wanted to lay out the process and Camden laid out the process, it clearly is not that and so again, we are committed to following the law here.

>>SPEAKER: Justin Roebuck from Michigan, a quick question on the timeline with the outside litigation that is going on. How has the agency communicated or has the agency communicated to the administration - and my understanding that 180 day timeline would require the changes to be made by September 21 or something like that. And so obviously that is not possible when following the law and so I'm curious if there has been communication to the administration to that extent or I guess maybe a more clear - does the agency have a timeline you know starting on this date if we were to make changes in VVSG, how long would that take?

>>SPEAKER: So, I'll take the second half and communication will take over and so no there is not a defined timeline and the executive order specifically lays out with applicable law. So, starting these conversations and in working with the administration as we are going to talk about. Considering and having conversations like these is within the 180 day window is how we view it. Because, we have to follow that general timeline or I'm sorry the VVSG process that does not come with a well defined timeline and realistically probably is not achievable within 180 days of the executive order, especially when it comes to approval through this process and things like that. And so we recognize the timeline and believe we are operating within the timeline without the definitive view of completion as you have presented and I'm not saying that

was your assessment, I'm just saying that is not how we are approaching it because of the applicable law provisions. And then as far as communications with the administration I will let the chair take over.

>>SPEAKER: So, communications with the White House is not always on our timeline, it is on theirs and so as a process that other agencies have a lot more experience with, when there is a EO that is back and forth on these issues, that process is beginning and what I would say - and so those issues will be discussed. There will be timelines and issues that the agency may have on meeting timelines. The other thing is discussing timelines - that is three times in one sentence - you know Camden is correct. And we already had a discussion at the TDGC and we were two thirds of the way complete with what a package may already be and there are other issues of consideration, there is the EO and believe me, before you launch into a 2/1 process you want to be aware of you know this is just one option, do we want to take this? And are there additional issues that we need to be considerate of? And so I guess my bottom line is we are moving and we are hopeful that we will be able to engage with NIST and the TDGC sometime in the next month and start that process.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you so much for answering. Just so I am clear, what I am taking away is that TDGC is required to make a recommendation before it starts triggering kind of that 90 day comment time? And you are surely - you are not going to restrict to the 90 days necessarily, you want to get it right is what I took away.

>>CAMDEN KELLIHER: Yes, we must first have VVSG that TDGC is making recommendation on. Now that does not mean they recommend VVSG, but we must receive -- that is at a minimum of 90 days. Fun stuff, all of this lives in my head and you hearing me talk about it.

>>SPEAKER: Stewart from Washington. So, Chairman Palmer, I just want to go back to one of your remarks about the national registration form and I think that you would agree that on the paper form or even the electronic version they are very rarely used, but if you would allow me to append onto your remarks, it is my understanding that under the national voter registration act, those providing assistance are also required to use an identical version of that form? And so while the national voter registration in itself is very sparingly used, the impact of that cascade to state agencies in the state of Washington. And so I think you and I are on the same page and I just wanted to add that into additional contacts. Commissioner Hicks, you mentioned in your remarks this morning and also just to raise awareness to this fantastic resource that you guys have published that you were presidential appointees confirmed by the Senate. And so I have a interesting question about as these timelines and deadlines play out, what is the process to having a EAC Commissioner removed? (LAUGHTER).

>>THOMAS HICKS: So, you have destroyed my - I was going to sit up here and not speak, but I think it is laid out in HAVA that we are serving and we shall serve until somebody else is confirmed and somebody else is nominated and confirmed.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you and I appreciate that and just another clarification and talking on today's other questions and so based on this slide here, below .3, the recommendations of the board of advisors and the standards Board only need to be taken into consideration for the three commissioners to provide final adoption. So, is it true and correct that these board of advisors and standards Board can have a non-successful vote to amend the VVSG and the three commissioners going against the vote of those boards?

>>CAMDEN KELLIHER: Yes.

>>SPEAKER: Greg, from Kentucky. The EO directed certain agencies to make certain federal databases available and I was wondering if you had some insight on Windows would be available in the process by which we could get access to those?

>>CAMDEN KELLIHER: I do not, Commissioner?

>>SPEAKER: And there are news reports that they are trying to fix the save database and I know some of you already use that which is kind of wonky and a little bit difficult to use and they have announced that they are going to make that available and try to fix the problems with it, but they did not provide a timeline on how long that is going to take. You know I think it probably would take some time and I don't think that is an overnight fix and you know I only know that from the news media. We have not been contacted by them with any details.

>>SPEAKER: Tonya from Arizona. So, first I would like to say that in my state the federal form is increasingly being used and as a state that has been since 2004 and collecting documentary proof of citizenship I would implore you to take a look at what other states are currently using and provide more flexibility in the documents for example travel ID and the like and you know so that we not only have a bifurcated system, but a trifurcated system and what regulations you are under, we are very concerned and that our already complicated system may become impossible with this process. But, also there was a focus group with the save program and I heard that the earliest that they can get that accomplished is 2026. I have been on a mantra to try and get the passport information and I understand that only about 58% of Americans have a passport, but that may the additional people that I can find to prove they are citizens to make sure they are full ballot voters in my state and if the way they were describing within the program that they would be doing this in my mind is backwards in the sense that I provide them a passport number and they will validate for me that it is a real number and that they have a passport and I was hoping to get - if I gave them certain PII that is collected on the form that you to fill out to get a passport, if I gave them that information, they could tell me if indeed a person had a passport. That makes much more sense from our point of view on anything that you all can do to encourage that would be great. But, save right now is talking about at best they will get it accomplished by maybe late 2026. And so as we are contemplating these requirements I would think that we need to put these requirements in place after the information is made available to the state and we cannot put the cart before the horse. And so I would implore you to work with them and find out when we are going to be able to have access to that information and only after that time put these requirements in place.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you for your comment. I think from my point of view there is a lot on the plate that we are trying to do and we are always willing to help facilitate giving advice to another federal agency or for there to be a part of a process that would facilitate the information flow to the states. So, if there is anyway that you could request or influence them to reach out to us to help facilitate that process - I think - I see the value in that obviously. But, sometimes things get put in a silo and they are doing their thing and we are doing our thing and I would just help that process, because we both know that it would help generally, the information flow, but we are trying to focus on us.

>>SPEAKER: Tonya, thank you. And also it is kind of complicated in that there is also the SAVE act out there and also the EO and we were already in a process of trying to work on the federal form to simplify it and make it a better form which you know, we are in the early stages

of that. And so there is a number of considerations that are going to have to be looked at and sort of reconciled and that is going to take some time.

>>SPEAKER: I was just going to say thank you for the consideration and taking the time to work with us would be greatly appreciated.

>>SPEAKER: I just wanted to share yesterday that I got an answer from (AWAY FROM MIC) and they told me that you can just start using it and they just will not charge you and so for anybody who is using it now or wants to use it, they will just not charge you and they are working on it on the backend (AWAY FROM MIC) in the working group is correct and trying to make changes and that is going to take a long time, but for those who currently use this system as it exists consistent with the EO, they are making it available at no cost and we are also trying to get a contact with the State Department to address the other point regarding the passport system. We are having some trouble getting a ICA contact and so (NAME) is now trying to help us so we can get at least something, an answer or something.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Amy.

>>SPEAKER: I have one more kind of related to the form if you don't mind, Mandy again from New Mexico. I am just trying to understand about how compliance may work. You know I appreciate the EAC and the team for always being able to help facilitate with federal agencies and this falls within the jurisdiction probably within the DOJ. And so within the extent that you have any information as to how that may function, right? Or required to record I believe the document Terry information related to citizenship, I am not sure exactly what that means, how that would be handled from a security perspective and what we should give guidance on to our locals and so I am just wondering if you all have any analysis on that and at this point and if you are able to work with us to facilitate conversations as we learn more.

>>SPEAKER: Yes, I think we can promise that we will work with you on that. Those are the type of questions in consultation that I would request that you provide us and maybe we are not thinking about. And as you sit here I have my own thoughts on that, but I think the most important is that we hear from you over the next month and if that issue comes up we will have a good way to address it. Yes, ma'am.

>>SPEAKER: Good morning, I am secretary Valdes from Maine. Sorry, I joined a little bit late, a late flight this morning. So, I have two questions and the first is about the verification of citizenship, because I think all of us agree that everybody who votes in our federal election should be a citizen, but the details of how one verifies that are certainly concerning when we are thinking about access to voting. And I read the Bureau of motor vehicles and one of the few secretaries of State that does and so we are confirming legal status and citizenship for the real ID and we are seeing record-breaking lines and we have highly trained staff and a immigration attorney on staff who finds herself working with senior citizens in Maine who have lived there their whole lives and they were born near the border and the closest hospitals were in Canada back in the day and so she works with them to try to figure out okay, where were their parents or grandparents born and sometimes their parents and grand parents were born in Canada even though they came home from the hospital to the United States. And so it is definitely a challenge for some including people who have served our country as veterans and again are most definitely American citizens. The question that I have - and I understand the SAVE act is a separate issue as Commissioner McCormick mentioned, but as we think about or as they EAC think about any rules for coordination or facilitation of verification of citizenship that election

officials are required to do, has any thought been given to allowing or permitting or facilitating the states to work directly with the DMV? Because, one of the - you know we for online voter registration are already pinging are motor vehicle database and that is something that we can do because of the frontline DMV officials have done, but the DMV officials are not registrars or election officials and so the idea of in Maine as you know, we run our elections at the local level and we have over 500 clerks and some of them working you know 15 or 20 hours per week in really small towns and the idea is getting them the equipment and the training to verify citizenship even if all of these databases to become available is concerning in terms of the cost and the ability to implement that where there are certain mechanisms where we are already doing this confirmation at the state and local government level. So, am just curious about that. You know setting aside whether this is legal or illegal - but, curious about that piece.

>>SPEAKER: Secretary Valdes, you are in a unique position actually integrating with your DMV, right? And so your insight would be helpful and I know often because of the help America vote act, I don't know what we could do with our business without interactions with the DMV's, but your insight on how that process works for you in Maine would be very helpful on how you do that verification process and what are the gaps and what are your concerns on that process and how can it be improved? And I do think that that is part of the solution and I think that we have been relying on assisted with the DMV that has got some issues, right? And they admit it on the verification of citizenship. It is not really designed for that, it was designed for identity, real ID act. And so that insight to us can be very helpful and I think just generally it can be helpful, because we are all in the same boat and try to use the DMV to help confirm or verify citizenship when they recognize it really was not designed for that process fully. And so I would appreciate the comments where you sit working and managing that DMV in your office.

>>SPEAKER: I echo that. You know I think with HAVA and the implementation of statewide databases and online systems you know we have seen a lot more connection with motor vehicle agencies whether to confirm drivers license number or potentially I know some states use that to also connect to Social Security over the last four, but you know I think Maine and Michigan are very well-positioned to have insight running both motor vehicles and elections to think about some of the challenges that some other states may not have the full vantage point where that lives in a different department or a different bureaucracy.

So, I certainly would welcome comments to what you have seen on the motor vehicle side and interacting with citizens on that end, thank you.

>>SPEAKER: I thought of a second follow-up regarding the executive order and I have a third question, I know that we are short on time. And the second follow-up is have you had conversations with the administration about the punitive aspects of the executive order? The cessation of law enforcement funding for states should the election officials in some way fall short of the criteria that are mandated? Because, I will tell you in Maine, we experienced swatting on election day and so we had multiple polling sites that were swatted and we were able to continue voting uninterrupted because of the training that had happened with the cybersecurity and infrastructure security and with ISAC and state partners and because of our election day situation room that had all of the stakeholders there and also the virtual situation room across the country and so we knew what was happening and we knew it was happening in Georgia and we could identify that this was a hoax to quickly.

And so to see the idea that DOJ grants to our state and local law enforcement would be zeroed out if election officials had an error in some way is a deeply concerning piece of that executive order, because - and I guess I will wrap in my third question, have there been any conversations with the administration about the zeroing out of election security funding for the election infrastructure information sharing and analysis Center on whose executive committee I also set currently chair, because again CISA and ISAC were crucial in making 24 the most secure election that we have had to date despite white powder mailings to election officials all across the country including in Maine and despite swatting and despite harassment and threats all across the country targeting election officials including in Maine. Sorry, that was two big questions.

>>SPEAKER: We know those concerns have been expressed to the house and Senate side and if given opportunity we will look at those concerns you know punitive, potential punitive actions. If given the opportunity.

>>SPEAKER: And finally on those lines, there was the elimination of the ISAC, CISA funding and that was a big blow and a lot of folks involved in that in this room and so we were glad to see a modicum of election security money in the continuing resolution until yesterday I went to sign the terms and conditions that I have done a secretary multiple times and realized that they were different. Different than the terms of prior election security grants to this estate and specifically there was language that would have required me to accept the administration executive order regarding diversity, equity and inclusion and disavow and lease any equity and inclusion programming across our state. So, I did not sign the terms and conditions and I am not submitting a letter today to request that election security funding even though we desperately need it, especially in the absence of the EISAC and CISA funding that we have had in the past, because that new addition to the terms and conditions is something that I believe to be contrary to main and state law and potentially to federal antidiscrimination law and also puts our department values, inclusive and representative hiring recruitment hiring representation, it puts us in potential legal jeopardy. And so I just want to convey that I really hope there will be some reconsideration of those new terms and conditions, because the new terms and conditions make it so we can't request or accept desperately needed election security dollars.

>>SPEAKER: Sorry, could you repeat that into the microphone?

>>SPEAKER: (AWAY FROM MIC) say it really loud.

>>SPEAKER: Can you hear me now? Dan Lee, Idaho. With section 4 and barcode scanners, will this have an impact on any already certified 1.0 system? Thank you.

>>SPEAKER: I think it is to be determined. I want to say no, but I think the office hours with our T&C team could be helpful with that. That could be interpreted a couple different ways, but that could be an issue and are never the whole barcode issue and still be used with voters with disabilities, it is an accessibility feature to your system and so there may be manufacturers that want to bring in a system that does not have the barcode issue that is a 1.0 system and go back through 1.0. But, because 1.0 has been grandfathered - is that the correct term? I think that is an open issue. Right now as you know 1.0 systems can only be updated with patches and small changes and not significant or major changes. And so as we transition to 2.0 that this is sort of a unique experience and changes in law is one way that a state or manufacturer can bring in a system for revision to 1.0 and so the question is would disqualify? And again I think

there is some ambiguity there and I think that is a great discussion for our testing and certification team if you have an opportunity to reach out to them. But, we will try to provide that guidance as soon as we feel we have guidance on that issue.

>>THOMAS HICKS: I am finding this incredibly helpful and I would also say that it would be very great and very good for me to have these comments sent back to us in the consultation letter. And additional comments, as well, because I can see on your faces there is a lot of concern in this room for this process and other aspects of it. And I would highly encourage you to send comments to us on that. And also it has been repeated with our LLC for the folks that are locals to cc your state person so that they know exactly what you are sending off to the agency and so they are not basically - kept in the loop, as well.

>>SPEAKER: One last one if I may. Mandy, from New Mexico. Secretary Valdes just raised an issue with the terms and conditions that was news to me and so I just wanted to flag that for our team. Can anybody what exactly the requirements are?

>>CAMDEN KELLIHER: We need to review those terms and conditions. We will provide an answer on that. We will address it.

>>SPEAKER: Kathy P of Rhode Island and can you blame the process for de-certifying equipment? Voting equipping?

>>SPEAKER: Right now there is a process of decertification in the manual which is in our EAC testing manual and there are different factors that go into that manual and with the EO there is consideration of potentially changing the manual or some other policy and nothing has been decided on that. And again, my commitment is to make sure any process adopted would have minimal impact on the states. And no serious impact on the states and the administration of their elections.

>>SPEAKER: I have just one follow-up question and this is Paul from Florida, probably just to rounded this discussion out because we are coming right up against time. So, somebody mentioned earlier obviously we know - your legal counsel started the conversation by talking about the fact that we all know that there are already challenges filed and at what level would an injunction pause everything that we have just discussed today about how we are moving forward? And what will that do to the timelines? And at what level - I know there is a lot of argument right now in the public sphere about can a Circuit Court stop the federal government from doing things and that is for all of the lawyers to argue and make more money about, but for the rest of us, we are just kind of interested in how a injunction like that at any level is going to impact the timeline or implementation as things are going forward.

>>SPEAKER: I would hope that there would be some clarity in any injunction. I think the language of the injunction is going to impact how we respond. And I am hoping for clarity one way or the other and not just sort of bouncing it back into our court, but we will see what the courts do with that.

>>SPEAKER: And to the court, there may be some issues and it really depends on what the court says. And we will review and analyze that and try to perceive what we think is the right thing to do in consultation with the department of justice and our representation.

>>SPEAKER: Delight Showman from Colorado, just one point of clarification. I thought the April 11 consultation letter was limited to documented proof of citizenship and it did not concern voting systems or the VVSG?

>>CAMDEN KELLIHER: Correct.

>>SPEAKER: That does not prevent you from sending letters on other topics that let us know how you think.

>>SPEAKER: All right. Thank you, commissioners, thank you, Camden for the helpful and a little clarity given to all of us. The discussion. We are going to take a quick break for about 15 minutes and we will meet back here at 11 AM. Thank you.

(BREAK)

>>SPEAKER: For any standards board members who won a 2024 Cleary award, we are going to do some quick photos and so if you won a 2024 clearinghouse award, come to the front please, thank you.

(BREAK).

>>SPEAKER: I think we are good, ready? Everyone, if we could have you make your way back to the room and take your seats and we will begin with the next panel with Commissioner Hovland. Thank you.

>>BEN HOVLAND: Welcome back, I know that it is hard to take you away from conversation, but luckily we will have a lunch break before too long. We are going to jump back into it. With this first panel discussion we are going to feature some of the EAC 2024 clearinghouse award winners and I would like to welcome Justin Roebuck to the stage, thank you for being prompt. If I could also have Katherine Berry, Howard Knapp and Maria Pangelinan come up. So, this was a record-setting year for the Cleary and a record number of applicants and we wanted to share a little bit about these programs and again, I think that so much of what the Cleary's are about is recognizing the great work around the country and really just at the core of the clearinghouse idea and sharing information across the states and recognizing that there are valuable lessons that we can learn from our colleagues across the country and so on to share a few of those ideas today. Katherine Berry is coming on down and she is first on my list here and so I will roll into a little bit of that. Katherine is the deputy administrator for the Maryland State Board of elections. Her office is text to cure program and received a clearinghouse award for innovation for new practices in election administration at the state level. To her left is Justin Roebuck, the clerk register for Ottawa County, Michigan. His office is not a podcast ballots and banter program received a clearinghouse award for distinguished voter education and communications initiatives, large jurisdictions, Justin, did you know that you are a large jurisdiction?

>>JUSTIN ROEBUCK: I did. I told my wife that.

>>BEN HOVLAND: Congratulations on that. Howard Knapp and his office received two Clearinghouse house awards this year, the prep for poles received one for distinguished education and communications initiatives at the state level and the voter education videos with American sign language subtitles program received one for the best practices for improving accessibility for voters with disabilities. And finally, Maria Pangelinan Executive Director for the Guam election commission and her office 2024 college poll worker program received a whole worker best practice in recruiting, retaining and training poll workers in small and medium jurisdictions. Thank you for being here with us. I just want to note for maybe those of you last

familiar with the Clearies, these are judged by your peers and you may have seen an email asking you to be a judge and for those of you who did, thank you. And for those of you interested in the future, keep an eye out for that. We had a great comment at the local leadership Council from Ricky Hatch of Utah who many of you know has been a judge before who really said that being a judge is one of the best ways that he gets great information about programs happening around the country. So, again I appreciate the folks that served in that way and I think it does help to highlight that these awards go to again recognize great work and that is recognition as well from peers around the country. And I think that makes it more special. So, with that I will turn it over to Katherine Berry.

>>KATHERINE BERRY: Thank you, Ben. Good morning, everyone. In 2023, Maryland General sadly passed a law that required the whole state of Maryland, we are a top-down state to provide voters with an opportunity to correct their omission and have their mail-in ballot counted if they did not sign on the envelope. It also required us to allow the voter to supply a signature through a digital picture message sent by a mobile telephone or email and also through a text message, email, online portal, a mail in form or in person. So, one of our largest counties that has over 700,000 registered voters did a pilot program that was called text secure for a special election.

They had a lot of success working out the kinks with the process and so in only 24 the state board of elections contracted with global mobile who has since been purchased by runback (SP?) and so the state board of election created a FTP site that had a secure access for global mobile and also for at least one person from all 24 jurisdictions in Maryland. And the state board of elections provided global mobile with a weekly list of voters who had requested a mail-in ballot and if a voter then returned their mail-in ballot that did not have his signature on it, the local boards were sending out a cure notice to their preferred method and one of the ways that the notice explained that they could provide their signature is through this secure portal. And so on the letter, the voter was provided with a specific code and they could just simply text MD to a phone number and the voter would then put in their secure number, verify their PII and then be able to simply turn their phone, sign with their finger and submit. The form was then uploaded to the FTP site to the local board so they could print and attach it to their mail-in ballot envelope. So, again, 2024 was our first statewide rollout. In the general election we had sent out 879,239 ballots and of the number that we received back which was a little over 65,000, 1100 were cured and 152 which is about 14% were cured by this text-to-cure method. And so we did have - it was not huge, but it was helping make it so that every vote counted.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you for that. And again, I think a lot of the reasons that some of the categories or some of the elements that go into choosing these are replicability and again whether or not these are things that can take place and as a sneak preview for some conversation tomorrow you know I know more and more jurisdictions are seeing challenges with signature verification and depending on your state law as it pertains to curing, this may be a solution we know about. And we will just go down the line, just and if you want to take it away.

>>JUSTIN ROEBUCK: Yes, thank you, Commissioner. So, our program as Commissioner mentioned was ballots and banter. Not a podcast. And this really stems from you know our goal in communication and my goal has always been to try to seek new ways of connecting with voters and how are we doing that effectively and switching it up a little bit and trying to be

different and trying to engage may be audiences that we have not engaged before. And so really coming into 2024 that was a priority for us and yet as we proceeded through the year, frankly I have to tell you September 24, this was not the top of my list, right? We were dealing with a lot of the things that everyone else in this room was dealing with and the reality is that we don't have a communications department in my office and I do not have a PIO in my office although I am a larger jurisdiction, I do not have a PIO with about 240,000 registered voters. So, at the end of the day, I kind of got to a point in September 2024 where I was having conversations with staff saying like we need to get some core information out just in a little bit of a different way. And we collaborated and partnered with our counties communications department and basically tested these snippet videos that came from a brainstorming session where we were like okay, what are the core ideas in the core things that we need voters to know prior to the election and the basics of the process as we are leading into you know Michigan was brand-new for early voting in 2024 and that was a constitutional limit that effectively most of her voters had never really voted and security elements that we want to discuss. And what we wanted to do is make it fun and a little bit casual and we walked into a room at the County building where we sat down and it was a total of two hours from start to finish where we just had these discussions. It was sort of moderated by another person on our staff and communications department took those and cut them up into eight segments that were a couple of minutes long and I think we were just - we were surprised with the level of engagement that we received you know thousands and thousands of views on these little podcast snippets and it was not a podcast and I want to be sure that people know, that we are not actually having a podcast, it just looks like a podcast.

And it was successful for us and what I like about it is that this is something that really was low-cost, low energy, during a time where we were really pressed for time and needed to do something, but it really was not a huge commitment on the part of my team or our communications office team, as well. And it turned out to be a really successful program and we are just really honored to be able to receive the award and just give a shout out to all of my colleagues in this room who have just done some amazing work and I know that we have a lot of Cleary folks here.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Justin and you know a challenge that we see particularly as we see changes and letting folks know about those changes and as Justin noted, not a lot of cost and time commitment and really got out there and even when we take out all of my views, still a good number. So, very impressive. Howard?

>>HOWARD KNAPP: Good morning, Howie from the great state of South Carolina and we were able to win two and our first one was the prep for the polls and basically a PR campaign for the election. All of the election officials in this room know that one of the most difficult parts of our job is making sure are voters themselves are prepared for the election. We always think about how we prepared and I was thinking about and talking with a very few number of my staff who are still with us today that were working in 2020 and one of the issues we had was voters were not completely ready to vote either with ID and we have had voter ID for a long time in South Carolina or just you know a whole myriad of issues. And so very simply what we want from the voters and we want them to be prepared and prep for the polls and to segue into the other award that we received, part of our prep was to create short videos, because you know we

have to keep it simple, short videos on how to do certain things and how to register and how to vote absences because that is new to our state with a really comprehensive law that was passed in 2022.

So, we partnered with the disability rights SC and I think every state has some organization like that and they advocate for those with disabilities and a whole myriad of topics, but they obviously are very engaged when it comes to elections. And so what they offered to do for free was they started with two of our videos and are absentee video and accessibility video and they got an interpreter and we inserted in the corner a small square where sign language interpreter interpreted the video live. And we will be doing the rest of the videos and their funding is tied to federal grants which shockingly are getting cut and so we will be paying for the rest of those videos for all of the videos we have at SC votes.gov and so prep for the polls and make sure everybody is included and that includes getting all our video squared away for anybody who wants to vote. And so those are our rewards.

>>BEN HOVLAND: Thank you, Howard, again. A great reminder of things you can do to improve service to your voters and make your products more accessible as many of you probably know or remember really at the core of help America vote act was ensuring the Americans could vote independently and privately and that is certainly something that we always like to lift up as an important component of so much of the work that we do and so thank you Howard for that. Maria? I lost my presentation -

>>MARIA PANGELINAN: Keep going?

>>SPEAKER: That was great.

>>JUSTIN ROEBUCK: Thank you -

>>MARIA PANGELINAN: We were honored to win a Cleary for our 2024 poll worker program. And for the 2024 general election, Guam had 62,098 registered voters. We had 22 polling sites, 72 precincts and what we wanted to do was get precinct officials and Guam needed 360 precinct officials for the 2024 general election. We applied for a grant and received a grant on the help America vote college program. Talk about synergy, we used this money to recruit and we partnered up with the University of Guam and I must give credit to Doctor Ronald M and Judy G from the Department of legal studies program. We got through the academic approval process and of course that is listed in the public administration degree program PA30A, elections administration. This course can be used towards their degree in public administration or as an upper division - as a upper division elective in most other majors.

So, we also offer the course as a professional development course for teachers to use toward their reclassification or recertification program. And so for the class in 2014 fall semester we had 48 students, 36 undergraduates and 12 teachers. It required that they meet with us for 45 contact hours and that included 18 hours as a precinct official. As a precinct official, they report to the precinct at 530 -- 5:30 AM in the morning and did not go home until all of the ballots are returned at the end of the night. We had record-breaking in that the latest was about 11 o'clock, I believe for our students. They needed to take and pass three exams and they were also required to do a paper and presentations and one teacher was assigned to every student group. The cost of the tuition was \$221 and we paid for that.

Also as precinct officials they get paid \$500 stipend. It is a long day, they start at 5:30 AM and again they are at the precinct and the school bus brings them up to our election return center. We move all of our central tabulation equipment to the University of Guam, it is the biggest university that we have that we can for the 360 precinct officials all spread out. And so the \$500 stipend really helps us recruit the college students. And so we have not used up all of our money. We want to update and we have precinct official training videos and so we are going to do that this summer. We are also going to offer an additional course this summer for our teachers, because we hear that there is a need for recertification classes. So, we are going to offer it and we hope that they all come back for the 2026 primary and general election.

>>BEN HOVLAND: Thank you, Maria. For those of you who are less familiar with the college poll worker grants, those are not - there was funding for that years ago and then in 2023 we saw another million dollars and we gave out a number of grant and really great stories like the one that Maria just shared, that was an event in Illinois a couple weeks ago where the college to pay -- college (NAME) was there and showed a little bit of a process and the formality that comes with the structures and again, those have been really impressive. With all of the grants there is a lag on reporting as you all know, but we are starting to see those and hopeful to get and share information about those programs beyond Maria's that you just heard about and again, very exciting stuff and I think can be helpful to so many communities around the country.

That brings us to the end of our presentations. I do want to acknowledge that we have many other Cleary winners, past and present here with us today and I don't know if you sought out at the break if you are not rushing to get doughnuts which I would not blame you for, we had a whole line of folks to take photos and I also want to acknowledge some of the other Cleary winners that have had great stories to share the division elections and the state of Alaska and Coconino County and the Secretary of State and the California secretary of state, Guam election, Maryland State elections Board, Ottawa County, the Nebraska Secretary of State office, New Hampshire Secretary of State office, North Carolina state board of election, South Carolina commission, office of the governor of Utah and Salt Lake County Clerk election division and the Washington office of the Secretary of State elections division. So, you are in good company here. I don't know if the winners want to stand for a quick acknowledgment and I just really want to embarrass you all and thank you! I am going to wait here. And it is between that and lunch!

Again, great work by so many people in the room and if you have not had a chance to check out the Clearies, those were recently announced and again, take a look at those, great ideas, all around. And a lot of winners and honorable mentions and part of why we do that with the clearinghouse function is to share those good ideas and even the ones that did not win our great ideas and may be the solution to your challenge. So, check those out please. I do not know if folks have - and we are running a little ahead of schedule which I am proud of us were doing. And I don't know if there are any questions about the specific programs that you would like to ask? Certainly we have a second to do that. We also can add a little bit more chat time for the break, but I also know that we are going to do a group photo before lunch so that when I

undoubtedly drop something on my tie, it will be after we have taken a photo and so we will be in good shape there. And I will do a little auction here on any questions for our winners. Yes?

>>SPEAKER: Jeff Hancock from Kentucky and I had a question for Katherine. You said was 49,000 for the pilot and how much for statewide?

>>KATHERINE BERRY: 49,500 was when we implemented statewide.

>>SPEAKER: I have a question for Justin, what was the platform is you are not a podcast, how did you push those short videos out? Was it all just social media or what did you do?

>>JUSTIN ROEBUCK: We did full episodes on YouTube and full episodes as in like I think the longest one was maybe eight minutes. But, the snippets we did on Facebook on X and Instagram.

>>SPEAKER: Secretary B, just to follow up on the video, the secretary of broadcasters reached out to us and invited us to do PSA's and I don't know if counties have the same relationship with broadcasters, but the states my and so taking those 30 second snippets we were able to take not quite as great as what you did and what you all have done is way more comprehensive and really impressive, but we were able to do an election security snippet, as well as anybody want to talk to your Association of broadcasters, they have to do announcements and that qualifies.

>>SPEAKER: Andrew?

>>SPEAKER: For Guam, the 45 contact hours, so the 18 hours on-site, can you talk a little bit more about what those other contact hours are and the exams, do you write the exams, do you help write the exams or sort of what does that cover? And are you using their presentations in the papers to help you for future things like are you sort of putting the students to work to help create things for your office? Or those sorts of things.

>>MARIA PANGELINAN: Thank you for the question. Of course - we like the almost free help. And so the 45 contact hours, a lot of it is lecture in the classroom at the University and the exams, we prepare ourselves, our law requires that they pass an exam. And so besides, we have the two exams and then we have the required exam that they have to pass as a precinct official. And we found that they still have to go to the regular three hour training for the other precinct officials, because during that training, they do count their ballots and feel them and they received them sealed on election day.

>>SPEAKER: One thing I will just highlight that I think a couple of the last comments really bring together from secretary B and the PSA opportunities as well as thinking about some of this in some of our work with both the college poll worker program and other work, we have seen a lot of really interesting collaboration and opportunities within institutions of higher education and one of our LLC members I believe had worked both with local TV and then also possibly with the journalism school on PSA's and we have seen other efforts and was able to visit the University of Michigan campus in the fall and CA collaboration there with professors from their architecture and design school where they had both worked on an on-campus polling place that was pretty extraordinary, but more notably to me anyway they had worked with some voter education signage that had started on campus and then spread broadly to the Ann Arbor community and while I was there I heard about other local officials in Michigan utilizing that specifically there was one that was voter education about what you needed to do to be prepared to put your ballot in a dropbox so that it was covered and so that it would be counted and that you are putting in the right place as we have heard you know too many stories this year about

ballots being put in drop boxes that should have been put in mailboxes and various other issues like that. There is clearly collaborative efforts that we connect floor on educational opportunities like that. And so I think that those are great highlight to bring those comments together. And Brianna?

>>BRIANNA SCHLETZ: I have one quick plug that at the request of all of you we have a clearinghouse index on the website and so you can search for any of the previous winners and that is at the bottom of the Clearies page and so thank you for making those 508 compliant and making those searchable for everybody.

>>SPEAKER: That means we want to see a lot more applicants next year, no pressure!

Well, I appreciate you all sharing and again I will turn it over to Kristin to tell us where to go for the photo and then it will be lunch and then we will be back here at one.

>>SPEAKER: So, we will be doing the group photo for standards board members right by where we are eating lunch and we will not have to be traveling far and we will delay lunch as much as possible and so if you go up to where we had breakfast on the sixth floor, that is where we will be doing the group photo, as well. So, you can make your way and I know the elevators are little bit slow, so we will have plenty of time to get that photo and have lunch. So, thank you very much.

>>SPEAKER: And a big round of applause for our panelists and all of our Cleary winners. Thank you!

(LUNCH)

Testing testing testing.

>>SPEAKER: Good afternoon everyone, if you can make your way back to the conference room here, we will get started in just a few minutes. All right, welcome back this afternoon, everyone. I hope everyone enjoyed their lunch and had good visits. We are going to keep you from having a nap here this afternoon and turn the floor over to Monica Childers, she is senior elections expert with EAC and give us a riveting discussion about audits! And she makes it fun! So, it is riveting!

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Thank you so much, welcome back from lunch. I hope everybody had a wonderful meal and has gotten some time to stretch and move around as we come back to our chairs here. I am delighted to be joined by Chairman Palmer who will participate in this conversation and the idea of voluntary federal audit election standards is his brainchild and so he will share some vision for this idea and also our chief election information officer who will be sharing some of her experience as local election official with audits, as well. As we think about whether a voluntary federal audit standard would be useful for the agency to produce, we want to hear from you, as well. So, we will get started with a little bit of content up here, but afterwards I will be opening up the floor for you to give us feedback about what your thoughts are and about whether an audit standard coming from the EAC would be a useful thing and how that might help you in your work and whether it may help you influence the decisions of your legislators or how your public understands audits and things like that. So, be thinking about in the back of your mind about any comments you would like to share on that front.

We did also ask you and members of the LLC before you attended meetings this week to fill out a short survey on your election audit practices and we just want to run through the results and we are always appreciate your feedback and to inform our work on best practices. And what we got from you and the LLC members is not representative data across the country, of course because not everybody filled out the survey and this is only LLC and SB, but what it showed is that there is a lot of different audits being conducted and we use to think of postelection tabulation when talking about election audits, but there are lots of other kinds that people are regularly doing. You can see logic and accuracy testing which is usually an audit, example of machines in many of your jurisdictions is the actual most common type that we found, but also lots of procedural process compliance audits, accessibility audits, voter registration audits and signature validation and districting audits were on there. So, lots of interest in this topic and lots of variation in what we do and I think the rest of the answers also sort of bear that out with the audit practices from state to state. One thing that was fairly consistent and may be the only thing that was fairly consistent across the responses is who sets the rules for your audits and almost everyone who responded said that the rules for their audits is that in regulation and not flexible or up to the local jurisdiction or election official to decide. So, that is one thing to decide and keep in mind and we always want to follow state laws first and foremost and that is important to any sort of standard reset is not in conflict with things that you are already required to do. Beyond that, the answers vary considerably across lots of different dimensions of auditing. So, from who can handle ballots and voting equipment which is obviously relevant when we are thinking but who should conducted the audit and who is able to conduct the audit, a lot of you said election officials and poll workers were the only ones good handle equipment, but also members of an election board or commission. Some of you allow contractors or vendors to handle equipment and ballots and some of you have designated law enforcement who also participate in the and so again a wide different variety of processes across the states and similarly party affiliation about half of the affiliation said they have to balance party affiliation when thinking about serving on the audit boards and the other half said they try to balance it or they are not required to consider that at all, because all of their election officials are considered nonpartisan and they don't even collect party affiliation. So, again a couple of different ways of doing things and similarly with chain of custody and who can observe audits, different practices depending on different states and most audits are open to the public media, whoever wants to attend, but there were a number of respondents who said no, we only allow candidate or candidate representatives to attend our audit or that it differed depending on the type of audit, we did get some responses that said welcome of these audits we do are open to the public, but these others are more internal and just for us. And so again, thank you for filling out the survey, we really appreciate your feedback and this does give us a better sense of where there are similarities across the states and where there are differences and that will help inform this discussion. So, I would love to turn it over to chairman Palmer to talk about your vision and how you are thinking about this idea.

>>DONALD PALMER: So, I am standing in for Ricky Hatch and his thoughts may be a little bit different than mine, but I do respect in talking with Ricky one of the things that I was encouraged by his that he is a financial auditor in a previous life and world and he brings that to how he analyzes audits and that sort of thing. And he was - I was very encouraged by our discussions and he was not able to make it today, but I would say that my sort of sense of this

came from a perspective of going through a series of audits from 2020 and on and there was a proliferation of legislation and ideas ranging from ballot tabulation to voter registration and future and process audits. And so a couple of anecdotes that I would hear in this period of time is we really wish and this is bipartisan sort of discussion is that we really wish that there were some sort of national guidelines in auditing and election auditing. And the reality is that there has been some attempts at the macro level like the Carter Baker convention mentioned that there should be national audits and auditing discussions and that audits are a significant part of the election process and then the PCA which I worked with, they mentioned audits and then I think NASS has done some work at how the state is looking at state audits and why is that important? Generally there is a consensus on both sides of the aisle that we want to see more foundational audit. And I think they are coming from the perspective of your hearing from their constituents and you know we may not trust the system or may need procedures to improve with transparency that the systems are working as designed or the procedures are being followed and so I think why you see and we had discussion over lunch is you see a proliferation of bills where the legislators may say to an election official that I heard this anecdote is where are you getting this from? Is there a national body or some sort of national research, what is some consensus driven election audits from the community? And there really was not anything for the election officials to identify. We knew that they wanted to do certain audits, but there was not anything available that the legislator could look at and say okay, this is maybe a centralized professional body.

And so I think that the EAC is well situated to sort of bring the different boards together and get the input on the different audits in the states and what are the parameters and ethics behind that? And what I mean by that is there are gaps in audits or in-laws that require audits sometimes and it can work to the detriment of the election community. And so the more that we sort of identify that these are the parameters of these different types of audits and that there is a lot of them and perhaps what they should be looking at as Ricky mentioned is really identifying different procedures that you can audit. To give a general sense of confidence of the audit. And so as we move forward, I feel that when you look at - we had a proposal from our team and we talk about for example an ethical standards for election administration in regards to the audits and transparency, very general principles and standards, but something that could set the perimeter of professionalism and ethics where you would have to respect the state laws or the local laws governing those audits. And so those are some areas that we have desperately needed and some guidance over the years in my opinion. And the real principal or the real vision is to develop these over the course as we do like other standards and all of the voluntary perspectives and getting the best from the different awards and stakeholders we have and development and requesting comment on that. And so I think that my goal was to sort of me and what I feel is bipartisan sort of demand for professional guidelines that people can at least .2 when they are developing their procedures.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Wonderful and Kammi, can you tell us how a federal audit standard voluntary, of course, but if you decided to follow it, how may that have helped you?

>>SPEAKER: So, in my former role I saw a little over 20 elections in 14 years, that sounds pretty familiar, we don't have any off year elections and so you can do the math there and like most of you is not all of you, the audits that we traditionally performed were the pre-logic and

accuracy and the postelection tabulation audits after reelection and we always did them in California, we had a 1% which oftentimes escalated to more than that traditionally and then starting in 2018 we started piloting a risk limiting audit including in 2020 and we were the first in the nation to pilot election guard which used encryption of castable records to maintain voter privacy prior to publishing online. And so that is my background and I have done several election audits like all of you and how national standards would have helped me is when I took over the role, I did not go to school, I was not a financial auditor and so I did not have a background in auditing. I was a poll worker for 10 years and I did have some familiarity with elections, but I basically learned how to audit from my predecessor. This is the way that we always did it and this is the outline and the law and we tried to figure out to make sure that we for our own selves were following what we thought our interpretation of the law is and what a good audit would be. The benefit of that would be to look at over our records and verifying that all of the tabulation increment was working properly and gave me confidence as an election official that when I certified the election that I knew I was certifying an accurate accounting of the ballots cast. My hope was that the audit would provide evidence, strong evidence to the public that we were following the process and procedure and that they could trust at the results of the election, as well paired however as many of you know, one of the trust gaps that we have in elections is not that we are not doing audits, because I believe all of you are likely doing audits at the front end and backend, but it is because we do audits a little bit differently that the public may not know whether those audits are effective. So, having a national standard for me at the local level would have helped me to be able to point to something, because as we all know as election officials, we are not judged at the local level where people may know us or where people are familiar with our laws, we are often now in today's environment judged nationally and so there are people that may be watching you perform your audits from a different state or different part of the country and because it may look a little bit different and because we all are following our different laws and statutes that they may not understand whether your audit meets the certain standards. And so certainly if we had election audit standards, it would help me communicate that collective story about how we are all - we may do it a little bit differently, but we are all out into a certain set of principles and it also would've helped me make sure that the procedures that I inherited that were accurate and sound and held to a certain standard.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Thank you, Kammi. I would like to open it up to the rest of you in the room and I see Secretary Bellows recently had some audits in her stay and so I want to hear feedback if you have been thinking about your updates, changing your audits, trying new audits, trying new things, what have your challenges been? What has worked well for you as you are thinking about this. Would a federal law, a voluntary federal law standard and I need to emphasize that, do you think that it would be helpful to you in your work and what do you have to share with us, I open up the floor.

>>SPEAKER: Jeff Hancock from Kentucky. The legislative body in the state of Kentucky past that we must do a risk limiting audit across all 120 counties and the biggest fear was that we did not have a set of standards. We did not know where we were going and how we were going to do it. The secretary's office tried to do their best to get us a list of suggested ideas and suggestions, but they came with no identity. For lack of better words.

I will tell you across 120 counties, it was a simple risk limiting audit where everybody had to audit one piece of equipment from election day and in the secretary's office, they would pick randomly what race we would audit. Across all 120 counties that came out flawless which we were lucky, because we did not have standards to go along with that. But, from a personal perspective, I counted a machine that had 852 votes in it and I was lucky enough to have a race on the ticket that was on every single ballot, because we did vote centers and there is a lot of different law things that we have to deal with. But, the only issues in the audit were the hand and eye portion. You know it did work flawlessly, but there were standards out there that we can all follow. We had written some of our own standards when you don't have guidance, you don't know the speed limit is, you make your own. But, I think from the federal - from the EAC perspective I think it would be very easy to handle.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Thank you, who else would like to share?

>>SPEAKER: (NAME) From Salt Lake City, Utah. I think it would be helpful to have standards and one thing we noticed is not only do we have more audits, but externally from different branches of our government that are being audited, specifically from our legislature. We have been audited by our legislative auditor basically consistently and it would be great to have not only standards that we could refer to, but that I could educate them on as far as what is proper and the best ways and best standards of procedure.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Thank you for that.

>>SPEAKER: Monica appeared over here, it is Tom from New York. So, just two things that if you were to do the standards I would love some thought on is in New York we do hand audits and we do also allow machine assisted audits. For the longest time we had a single vendor that was authorized to do the automated audit and that vendor it was not a big deal, because they really only did this in central count and they now have a precinct system and they want to audit themselves which we are not going to allow. Our regulations a level of independence, but there is no real definition of that. I did speak with John Panick earlier whether the EAC has any language on how independent is independent? And I don't care about the tabulation product because it cannot be the same software. And then another thing that has come up with some other ideas is instead of in New York, the automated tool still has to rescan the original ballots and we also have a vendor that is interested in possibly bringing a tool to the state just looking at the original scanned images and so knowing if there is any kind of best practices around the and any default to using the images vs. the rescanning of the ballots themselves.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Thank you, Tom, wonderful considerations. Secretary, I know that you have been waiting.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Shanna Bellows from Maine and this was our first year piloting a risk limiting audit and we really appreciate Monica's help and the EAC 's help in terms of the training that you did last spring was extraordinary and then just the technical assistance and advice along the way. It was really helpful to our success. I think two things, for the smaller states like Maine and we have such small groups of voters, it really creates some limiting factors and because we administer them at municipalities and not counties and we have municipalities with as few as three voters, it creates an additional rainfall and so as you are thinking about national standards, it can be challenging to create standards that apply to states that do County-based elections vs. municipal elections and certainly in terms of the different races that you decide to audit, you know we were trying to audit our state legislative races and we have maybe

20,000 voters in a district and maybe less than 10,000 voters in a state house district and so that just creates just challenges, short of hand counting all of our ballots. And so as you think about standards and the environment that we are in where so many people have different perspectives on what an audit is or is not, maybe it is guidelines or best practices or something short of standards until you are able to really truly get to a place where states can truly actually do what those best practices or recommendations are, because we would hate to be in the doghouse because we cannot beat national standards because they were written for states much larger than ours.

And the only other thing I would mention because it was a really special body of work and I got kind of lost in 2022 or 2021 rather the national Association of Secretary of State did a task force on postelection audits and we came up with unanimous recommendations for audits and we all agreed and this was a bipartisan group of secretaries from a very diverse group of states and we adopted that and posted it on a NASS website. That was not standard, but a principal that we could all agree on and it was a really powerful set of principles and starting point in some ways although it is not nearly as practical or useful as some of the EAC assistance that helped us complete our process. Thank you.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Thank you for that and that is a wonderful callout. The NASS standards for postelection tabulation audit is definitely one of the resources we have been looking at as a model, because it was able to be a bipartisan agreement and because the standards are at a higher level of appropriate to a lot of different states to a lot of different policies and not wanting as you said to box anybody and because they are in a small state or large estate, all of those things have to be considered in our goal is always to produce things that would be helpful to you and not produce things that could be used poorly. And so we are very cognizant of that, thank you for bringing that up.

Anyone else? Karen?

>>SPEAKER: This is Karen from North Carolina. And thank you for discussing this. One of the things that comes to mind for me when we present during our certification meeting of the election and go over our postelection audits is trying to establish what the purpose or the intent, why did we even do that? So, I think clarifying if the objective is to prove that the tabulation was accurate, these audits meet that in this process. If you are trying to determine that there was no ballot stuffing, these audits address that or confirm or deny that. And then you know we focus quite often on just right there at the postelection audit, but I would encourage us if we are going to look at standards to think about other audits that are ongoing and audits that are being performed with voter registration rules and things of that nature. Because, I think if we can define the objective and what they can prove or disprove, then maybe we are getting at some of the concerns that get raised when external individuals to our processes think that this kind of audit gets to that concern, but really it is an apples and oranges at that point in trying to define the type of audits that seek to answer what we are after.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Thank you for that. Absolutely if you are familiar with financial auditing standards, that is a huge principle in financial auditing, establishing before the audit begins, this is what it is for and here is our objective and this is how we will gather and sticking

to that throughout the audit and absolutely, I think that is incredibly useful that clearly has some relevance in election auditing, as well.

>>SPEAKER: And if I could just add, we piloted risk limiting audit and that is not what is required in our state law. But, that was one of those very key things that we had a hard time getting the public to understand why you do not count every single ballot. And that that is not a question of election practices, those are auditing practices across many industries and fields and trying to draw that comparison.

Unfortunately it was not well received by our board members and so we are stuck with what we are required to do, but nonetheless.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: I know it is not very comforting, but the gap between what people think it should do and what it actually does is not unique to election auditing and it actually exists in all audit fields and there is not a silver bullet yet, but it is a really important point.

Commissioner Hovland, did you -

>>BEN HOVLAND: Thank you, Ben Hovland, EAC, you may or member me from a few minutes ago. I just want to echo something that Karen had highlighted and thinking back to Ricky Hatch from Utah who is an admitted audit nerd and I think he does like 17 audits that he rambled off and it was impressive.

But, one of the things that he stated at presentation and LLC was the confidence that that gave him internally about the controls and the processes that are in place and that they are working the way that they are supposed to and I think obviously I think that has been a lot of the historic reason why we have done these things in elections and certainly it is why a lot of us network you have confidence, but I do think to Karen's point, just thinking about how we communicate that externally and how this work can add to that. And so being able to communicate that and being able to talk about this in an accessible way for the public is a big deal as we think through what this is and again, particularly that wide array of audit and you know most of this conversation is really on postelection tabulation audits and in the LLC conversation we also went down a little bit further on more process audit and again, all of those pieces have a value and tell a story and are part of what makes our elections secure. But, I think making those distinctions and telling the stories a little bit differently rather than just lumping in all of them into one umbrella is also important.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: That is a wonderful segue, Commissioner thank you for that. And I would love to turn it into a different direction and talk more about communications, public communication about audits is maybe the hardest part of doing the audit is talking about it. And so I would love to hear from all of you, what have been the challenges when talking to your various stakeholders in public about audits? What has worked well? Are there things that have not worked well? We have often heard that the word audit itself can be problematic. And so I will leave it there, but open it up to the floor, what has worked and what has not and what are your concerns around public communication of your audits?

>>SPEAKER: I will lead off, Paul from Florida. It really comes down to education and it was mentioned, having a voluntary, even a voluntary federal standard to better inform them about this is what a process should look like or could look like to better inform and whenever I am speaking to (NAME) Rotary or wherever I get invited to, I and avidly when I am talking about the

process to check ourselves and the logic and accuracy, the post certification, I always challenge everybody and I say how many of you have been to a logic and accuracy audit, does anybody raise their hand and nobody rises their hand and I say stop by. And then I say how many of you have ever been to a post certification audit, raised your hand and I say yes, stop by, it is never crowded. And when we first did our audits in Florida back in 2008 is when we started the August primary. And I remember because we randomly picked my race. But, the public does not understand what the audit process is and so having something else to point to and just getting that word out that yes, this is something that we actually do and the phrase I like to use it does not matter if we are voting for the president of the United States or a dogcatcher, there is always an audit done every time. It does not matter how big the election is or how small the election is, we go through the same processes. The president of the United States, city of Laurel Hill, 306, we all go through the same process and it does not improve attendance to the event, do not get me wrong. All it does is inform them better that yes, we are doing these things, they are public, you are welcome to come and pay attention, but if you are just happy trusting me, then I am happy carrying on doing what we are doing. So -

>>MONICA CHILDERS: That is wonderful, Paul, thank you. Others?

>>SPEAKER: One thing I will mention is that Ricky yesterday mentioned the hash validation and that has become a procedure that our field services team had been working with states and localities in the quality of monitoring program and he mentioned that because you know it does sort of - it is an example of why we use an audit, a type of audit to confirm and sort of increased voter confidence and it is that type of thing that there is always questions or allegations potentially that software or hardware of the systems have been altered. And it is a simple test and it actually can take a while to complete depending on the breadth of it, but it does sort of put another tool in your box to consider on being able to confirm with the public that these systems have been tested pre-election or postelection that the software and hardware had not been altered.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Thank you for that. Tom?

>>SPEAKER: Tom from New York, I know that there's probably a number of people in this room who have tried to be a little bit more proactive with their communications and set up just reminding people that they are welcome to come to observe the audit and go ahead and you know video the audit and put it online or live stream it. And so I'm curious to know for those folks who have done it, have they found that to be a successful way of communicating with the voter population and do they see engagement and is a nice to have, but not really getting them much?

>>SPEAKER: One of the things that I have observed that is interesting is that some states have audit divisions and some legislatures have audit divisions that have increasingly involved with election, state or local offices and they will provide a full report and my hope is that they have enough understanding of elections to be a document that is valuable to the community. Sometimes that is not necessarily the case. But, they have a bigger platform than we do in many ways, because that report is in the legislatures and sometimes they adopt it and leadership will review it and it is out there forever to be scrutinized by outsiders. And obviously then we have to work to remedy the situation. And you know when the legislature or as a separate body within a state government does not audit an election office, state or local, that is a big deal. And it gets a lot of publicity, good or bad.

>>SPEAKER: Yes, turning to that topic, how many of you have had experience with legislation? Stuart, would you like to chime in?

>>SPEAKER: I do, Stuart from the state of Washington. Just to sway away from the previous conversation and into this one, the state of Washington I found it particularly interesting when anybody asked me anything about audits, because kind of to Paul 's point nobody finds it interesting until they see a Facebook post or something. And so what I find particularly interesting is engaging with them on a little bit of the background on why they are asking that question and I always start from the beginning and I think Commissioner Hovland started it from the chain of custody on all of these things. Because, if you don't have chain of custody your audit is meaningless.

So, I always start the conversation from the FACA voting system certification and then all the way through election audits and regularity reviews and the whole file always connect with something new that they did not understand or that the state of Washington does and so there is that moment where they realize that you guys do take this seriously and to Paul 's point, a reason to trust you guys and the outcomes. But, in the state of Washington as far as the legislature is concerned, we have been very successful in working with our legislature in a bipartisan way to be able to increase the risk of limiting audit and in fact, we are working with them, because I think the title risk limiting audit is not well received by the public, it looks great in legislation, but what we have - rebrand it as is a hand account. People love that term and that is exactly what it is. And so we are continuing to look out in those terms of not only what our legislature needs, but how they can turn into Commissioner Palmer's remarks, use their platform to their constituents about the great things that Washington state does to be able to continually improve postelection audit in our state.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Thank you for that. I know others of you have legislatures.

>>SPEAKER: I was going to offer to answer Thomas 's question and so Karen from North Carolina again! And I think Thomas you are asking how effective it has been to make logic and accuracy testing or postelection hand counts available to the public. Since North Carolina enacted that in 2006, they have always been publicly available for public meetings and publicly noticed. Do a lot of people show up? No. But, do we find in telling our story that was a part of our campaign that we started in 2019 to tell more about the security practices and so forth that we have in place in North Carolina, we have seen some uptake in interest and that means going from zero to maybe five people out of 10.

And we do know that having that information out there, it takes away the curtain and it promotes the transparency that we want people to know. And it was actually one of the things that came up in our group during the ideas workshop yesterday was to be more public when you can be in these events. When you are running queries, making those reports available online is about all you can do and you know you don't need people sitting at the computer with you, but - for the legislature part you know as I mentioned the postelection audit has been a requirement in our state law since 2006 and we have some legislation right now that is looking at modifying some, but not really the method, just the selection process slightly in our randomization and we are looking ourselves at the potential of how to improve it and how to help counties budget for it. And that is something else that I would flag in these random audits in a state like North Carolina

where in person early voting is very popular. It is doomsday in the certification time to do everything to certify an election and you draw your largest early voting precinct which may represent 60% of the votes cast and having the facilities to count and having the days to do it and you know we are trying to look at ways where we don't take the randomization out, but we do - if nothing else the county is no better than the worst case scenario and is really just planning for the best case scenario.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: That is really important. For those of you who have these very large batches of ballots, those getting chosen is a big deal and it is hard if it is a random draw, you cannot anticipate that, but that is an important point that we can help sort of give you a range of what this could look like and is there surge capacity? Is there ability to bring in folks from other counties to help or something like that? Any other comments on legislatures? Dwight, or anything else?

>>SPEAKER: Not legislatures so much, but in terms of national standards I think it is important for any voluntary national guidelines or what have you to emphasize the timing issues like for example a restricting audit and the time to do that is before you generate ballot styles, not after. You know?

And/or the tabulation audits, ideally of course you want to complete that audit and confirm that the outcome is correct before you certify. That is not always possible and in the states where it is possible, man it gets very tight to get it done. And I think members of the public just are not sensitive to those issues and at least on the risk limiting side you are always going to have issues on how to select the target contest and if that is random, is it permissible to impose some guardrails like we are not going to select for the audit a contest that is within the states mandatory recount range, because that will essentially require a statewide hand count in a matter of 10 days which I do not know how we would possibly do that.

So, just the expression of those practical and a very kind of legalistic concerns I think would be very helpful to be contained in national guidelines. Thank you.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Thank you for that. Yes, the calendar is always tight, Mandy, go ahead.

>>SPEAKER: I just had a general comment that some of my peers have touched on, but I think overall it is important to highlight that this is one piece of what we do, right? Because it depends on kind of the understanding of the audience and so it may be the legislature and it may be the voters or the media, but you can explain the audit process and I think you need to do that in context of the larger picture of all of the other things we do to make sure that there is security and transparency and all of the checks and balances that come along with it.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: That is a great point and we talk about this in our communication about audits training a lot that this is actually an opening to talk about some of those other processes that folks can add context if they hear about them.

Any other feedback, this has been wonderful, thank you so much for your engagement.

>>SPEAKER: Stewart from Washington again. Since there was a little low there I wanted to just spice it up like I like to do. Thank you Commissioner Hicks. We are all making the assumption that the human is doing the audit and I would like to suggest that artificial

intelligence will enter our arena in a very real way both in the election audit standards and systems and technologies available to administrators. And it kind of occurred to me as my colleague from Colorado was speaking to the very practical implementation of some of these audits and having very significant outcomes on human beings that will be able to do this and I think efficiency means automation which means technology and means computers. And so I don't have an answer for you on that, I just think that as we think through in the future, five or 10 years from now that that is something that is very real in my mind.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: Thank you, that is a really important point and we talk about software independence, if you are doing that, you are familiar with that term using the humans because we are testing the software. And we are checking it and the humans are how we do that and I think that is a really important point. Any last thoughts before we wrap up? Go right ahead.

>>SPEAKER: Catherine from Maryland. We do various audits from beginning to end and everywhere in between and we are going to be implementing our first RLA in the 26 election and Monica you are coming out in a couple weeks to do RLA in a box and so shout out to that program, thank you. But, one of the audits that we have had success with as far as communications with the public and the legislature is the automated audit. And so we have all 100% of the ballots that are scanned off to a vendor that they then do their own tabulation and it is a comparison with what was scanned with our units - excuse me - and what we essentially can use those reports for is for people that are close to having a recount, they can go and look at the ballot images and really zoom in at the ballot images that have some questionable areas is avoided in some cases, people pushing to do a recount, because they can see what the ballots look like. And then more recently, FOIA all of the time for the scanning unit report and we are able to point them to our website, because now we have posted all of the automated audits on our website. It is 100% of the ballot images and it has satisfied a lot of curiosity and we are able to just you know point people to not and we have a pretty robust area on our website that talks about it. So, I think that is something if any of you have the funding for it to definitely consider, because it just kind of takes some of I guess that human aspect, but we also do human aspect things, as well. And so it is for all audiences in Maryland.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: That is wonderful, thank you, Catherine. The belt and suspenders approach in many states people have found helpful because nobody is going to be convinced by everything. And so a lot of different tools in your toolkit is really powerful. Any last thoughts?

>>SPEAKER: Andrew from Nebraska. Stuart had made a comment that made me think of an audit that we are doing which is the hash validation audit that we did the pilot with the EAC on and A, it was great to have field services come out and we really appreciated that. And one of the things that we have struggled with for a while was your comment to say hey, from the testing labs all the way through, start from the very beginning of certification and so you have these hashes from the testing labs themselves when this was first on and not only is it checking that your software has not been manipulated by malicious code or some thing like that over the years, but that you were not sold a false bill of goods. That your vendor said hey, it has been certified, we swear it is the same thing and you are able to say yes, in fact it is. And nobody has messed with it since then. We are always able to point towards risk limiting audits and postelection audit before to say that we know it counts right, but we cannot prove to you the software code. And it was a really useful tool in our tool chest.

>>MONICA CHILDERS: That is wonderful to hear and I'm so glad to hear that, thank you for sharing. I'm going to wrap our session up, we are at time, but I wanted to say before we go, thank you to everybody who engaged today. We are going to be following up with you on this idea and never fear if you're interested in being a part of a working group to think more about this idea, you will have opportunities and you will be able to make us open and transparent of a process as we can and to have you all at the heart of it helping to craft whatever we come up with. So, there will be more communication coming up about opportunities to help you in the future, but thank you for the feedback today, we really appreciate it.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Monica. Okay, I would like to ask Maria to join us and Shelly, as well. So, we are going to give you a little presentation and discussion along with you about the regional meetings that we were able to attend earlier this year.

And I will turn the floor over to Maria to begin the discussion.

>>MARIA PANGELINAN: Hello again. Region one and region six of the standards Board had face-to-face meetings. Ours were in March and yours was in December. Fortunately for us in region one we met in Guam. Region one consists of American Samoa, the five territories, American Samoa, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, US Virgin Islands, Guam and Puerto Rico. So, we all met with the support of the election assistance commission and it was probably one of the most learning experiences for us from the islands. As you know, we have small population basis with the exception of Puerto Rico. We range from 12,000 voters I believe - we on Guam have 60,000 registered voters. And so from that you almost are able to know that we are separated by vast oceans. And so we cannot go to our neighbor and borrow the equipment. If our equipment is down and out. And so we have the necessary requirement of redundancy. We learned so much from each other and we learn from the election assistance commission and I think we effectively were able to let the election assistance commission be able to know how best to help us, did that happen in region one?

>>SPEAKER: Sort of. Yes. It really did and I found that those of us who were able to attend the meeting in region one, we held our meeting at the new Los Angeles County ballot processing center. And we were so incredibly lucky to be able to see that facility. I do not believe Dean is here today, but he hosted us in that facility and you talk about a state-of-the-art facility for our nation's largest voting jurisdiction. They have their own helipad. And so just an incredible operation and they literally have thought of everything. And so as an election official you feel proud that that is how well we are running elections in this country with those state-of-the-art facilities and everything is covered. Every detail is noticed and taken care of. And so there is a lot of security there and it really was a great opportunity to see that facility. Go ahead, Shelly, do you want to add to that?

>>SHELLY JACKSON: Yes, thank you. We went to the region one meeting in December and yes, I was absolutely in all of the facility and very jealous I might add. I have worked in some really nice offices, but that was fantastic. And do you want me to address some of the logistics and feedback? So, I just had some thoughts about things that we prepped for this call to address and they asked us to talk about the timing and I don't know that there is ever a good time for us all to fly somewhere and meet, but I do think it is important and I think December worked just as good as any other time and I got a little bit of my Christmas shopping done at downtown Disney. So, that was helpful. But, I think even this month my office thought it was a

great time and my locals were buried statewide which is why we are leaving tonight and so there is never a good time which is my point with elections. I think having a postelection is great with the pre-election and it is great you know do not have to be dealing with so many emergencies and it also provides time for maybe a little bit of therapy which was useful at Christmas I think. And the format - well, I thought the half day was a little bit too short and we are just getting in the group and it was like okay, thank you for coming and have some lunch and you know I think it made it very good in person is pretty valuable whether it is in the meetings or in the breakout sessions and having those wheels going out and I know last night we had quite a few conversations about some different tribal issues and things we were working on and so I always think that those are more beneficial and may be a balance, but I do think that the in person is also important.

>>SPEAKER: For those of you in the audience that have attended a regional meeting, what were your biggest takeaways after connecting with the EAC and colleagues in regional meetings over the last few months?

>>SPEAKER: Mine was there and I don't know if there were a lot of folks in our meeting there - yes, Tonya was there.

>>SPEAKER: Can you speak into the microphone, please?

>>SPEAKER: I would echo Shelly's comment that I thought it was a little bit fast. We need a little bit more time to - or maybe more often and you know in person is great, but maybe if we could do regional meetings remotely on I don't know, a quarterly basis or something to touch base, I think that would help develop those relationships, but found it wonderfully helpful to connect with my neighbors and started talking about and sharing the different things that we were going through and that we had experience. And so a wonderful idea and I would say longer and more often.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you.

>>SPEAKER: I can add to that, too. I agree. I think a full day would have been better. It was terrific and we worked really in a roundtable scenario when you could just talk back and forth with each other. And it was really helpful to do it shortly after election certification, because everything was fresh on our minds and we really started out with what went right and we all felt really good that what went right and one of the biggest takeaways was what went right was over preparation. We were preparing for everything. That we could have imagined. And almost everything went right. We had a few issues in region one we had incendiary device placed in a box in Portland and our elections director explain how they dealt with that and he was really tickled that the planning all went really really well for him other than one small piece that he forgot to include in his emergency plan was that he did not have communication to himself in that plan. And so his staff managed it really really well and he got to work and said okay, I did not know this happen. And so other than that happening, that went well. No ballots were damaged and they had every plan in place to deal with it and so we were able to share that things went well and just to share all of those details and intricacies with each other while they were still fresh in our minds was really helpful. So, I think shortly after the election was great.

>>SPEAKER: Laney from Utah, it is really helpful to have these after an election because it is still fresh in your mind and you can talk regionally about what went really right and then may

be some opportunities that we can learn from each other of how we can grow and it really does help when you have your neighbors next to you for those informal chats, it would be nice if it was just a little bit longer so that we could have had more of the opportunity to maybe have more of an informal one on one or two or three on one kind of discussions.

>>SPEAKER: Even the tour, even though our meeting was short and a lot of us look around for an hour and a half and did a more extensive tour and it generated a lot of talk.

>>SPEAKER: I would add to that as well for the tour, I think that seeing those offices is invaluable to those of us that work in our own space, we do not get to see everyone else's space during an election and that is just the reality of it and so to be able to see even the organization and the design and all my goodness, you thought of this or thought of that, that is a great idea. Just to think about layout is so important because we don't get to see all of these offices that do it really well. So, I missed that opportunity actually this meeting because we tended to do that when we visit to at least do a tour of an elections office to see how they are doing and I think that is really important for all of us to be able to do that.

>>SPEAKER: For those of you that have not attended a regional meeting, what have you heard from the discussion so far that resonated with you?

>>SPEAKER: Justin from Michigan. I think all of this mix a whole lot of sense and we have done a little bit of this with some organizations that I have been a part of, but I guess I am just curious, is this something that has been member directed, the two regions that have met so far? Is this EAC directed? Is there a plan for moving forward with regional meetings around the country? And you know kind of looking toward a future and where we see this going? Because, it definitely sounds helpful.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you for that question, Justin, this is Ben. I think a few things there, for the standards Board, the regions are newer and we saw it with the LLC and it was a success and we sort of wanted to bring that over and this has been sort of an evolving experiment if you will both based on time and resource considerations and I think we are looking at a few different ways to do this. So, with the event in LA we had and a half day for the standards and a half day for the LLC and had those regions me and it sounds like maybe a little bit more time. But, we also did that with a postelection field hearing and so that was convenient. You know we are also looking at virtual options during the LLC meeting that just wrapped a number of the regions are looking at having more regular virtual conversations. Some as often as monthly and others quarterly and so again, I think really when we looked at this it was knowing that having a vehicle to talk in a smaller body obviously this is great and it was great to get off 55 states and territories represented here, but it is also a big room and sometimes it is nice to really deep dive and we have seen those commonalities you know really actually some of the origins for this and there was - a shout out, there was a Western states meeting I think in 2019 and some of what we heard about that was just the ability to really deep dive on postal issues with other vote by mail states rather than for the Oregonians sitting through a panel that did not mean as much to them although they are broadly supportive of the poll workers. And they are glad that they don't have to recruit them as much anymore.

So, it has really grown from there and I think a part of this session and what we love to hear is sort of what is working and what is not and as far as what the future looks like, generally I think that the feedback we have heard has been positive and that people like it and I will say that

there are only so many of us and funding probably limits our ability to do all six regions in a given year and so a lot of what we have talked about is having somewhat of a rotation and recognizing that we rotate the annual meeting down through the regions and are trying to and so balancing that a little bit with having a regional in person and then having some virtual's as well and certainly, certainly if there are demands and resource changes you know that is something that we can take into consideration, as well.

>>SPEAKER: If I can add one more thing to that, we have heard in our regional meeting, we heard from voices that always don't speak out in this large group and I'm probably one of those that may make one comment during a two day time, but I think it is nice to hear from others. And we appreciate everybody who speaks up here, but it is nice in that small group.

>>SPEAKER: This is Paul from Florida and I think it would be very beneficial just from that perspective of having people who in that smaller group are may be more comfortable speaking up and getting a chance to stay connected with the same people in your region has got to be just - I mean God bless region 64 your geographic diversity. And just being and I don't know how many time zones between Puerto Rico and American Samoa -

>>SPEAKER: Quite a few!

>>SPEAKER: So, you win the geography award, but just to be able to get together with people of similar situations I guess - and have discussions that you may not get to have here and you know we do not always cluster in the same clusters after the meetings are over necessarily or have a chance to visit with our counterparts in those other regions and so I am looking forward to how this continues to evolve moving forward and participating.

>>SPEAKER: So, for American Samoa and Guam, the travel time is quite a bit. Excuse me - so, we would like to know what would make these regional meetings a valuable use of your time?

>>SPEAKER: Andrew from Nebraska. I really do think that come lottery of your neighbors around you and doing this with other organizations where you have that together time and the concept of an election office every time we have had one of these conferences where it is included in a tour of like Maricopa for example and being able to go on-site and see the different practices in place, even if you do not have the resources to do exactly what they are doing and being able to have a conversation about okay, you're doing that and I can see what you are doing and well, we do it like this - and I think that is super beneficial and it almost seems like rotating where you are going to be at and so maybe your flight is long one time from Guam and then the next time it is hey, your hosting and people can see how you do it on yours or even between different states and it is like rotating which state you are meeting at would be beneficial to be able to see exactly how they are doing it. But, I like the communication back and forth.

>>SPEAKER: This is Steve Daitch, EAC and how they have used their region so far. In a slightly different set up from the standards Board in that there regional committees are incorporated into their executive committee. And so those are established and they have regional chairs that can help set the tone for those meetings. And one other thing that came out of the LLC meeting earlier this week was the desire to do more virtual sessions which was brought up earlier. So, I wanted to highlight that through the civic roundtable platform on the clearinghouse network we have multiple communities set up and there are currently set up established communities for LLC regions and my intent is to help the LLC use those regional communities to facilitate conversations outside of these meetings. But, a key feature that is new

to the platform is videoconferencing. So, you don't need to have a professional zoom account and so if there is interest among you know any individual region that is something that I think EAC can help facilitate is establishing those communities and making sure that folks can talk and engage.

>>SPEAKER: That would help us in region six considering the time difference. And yes, we will get on the ball and get on that. What kind of topics or formats would be most helpful? In these regional meetings?

>>SPEAKER: I was on the LLC before I came to standards and they get elected. There is like an elected position in each of the regions and that is what you're looking to do for standards?

>>SPEAKER: I don't want to imply anything for standards Board, I was only just sharing information about LLC! No worries!

>>SPEAKER: I guess like the format of that would make sense like if we want to have more frequent meetings there has to be like a number one in each region and that would make sense to do an election and like what else Steve does.

>>SPEAKER: Democracy!

>>SPEAKER: Go ahead. I think one thing from yesterday's session, one thing that was really good is that we all are unified in the subject matter. And so if that continues on with regard to whatever is discussed in that regional meeting for that time, that would be very helpful for especially us in region six. And the Executive Order is something that is very - you know we are trying to grasp that in our small isolated area, but the technology of getting information and then we get inundated with all of the different information that we want to know and so which one do we pick and which one do we follow?

So, that is the kind of discussions that can be very helpful for us in region six.

>>SPEAKER: I will add and I think meeting jointly with the local leadership Council was very helpful, too. Because, we do not see them at our meetings. And so even when we had them yesterday at the joint learning lab which was terrific, just having those conversations with folks that are not part of this body but yet the same subject matter and so they are really organizing themselves to piggyback along with what they are doing is really helpful, because it keeps us from having to formalize that, but if they are already doing it as part of the EAC, I think that simplifies a part of that process of okay, they will have a joint meeting here and that would be the one and we don't really have to ramrod it, but I think it would be helpful to keep piggybacking with them and jointly, because they have the same issues.

>>SPEAKER: Andrew from Nebraska again. In talking about what we may like to see at these regional meetings I think that I really like the concept of a after action report sort of style where after the general election and talking about what went well and what did not go well and you know things that you overcome and then you know what are you currently facing right now and what are you working on for the future? What is your next year looking like? Your priorities and things that you can fix? So, you sort of get an idea of where people are at and where they are going towards and you say maybe that is a good idea I can work on that, too.

>>SPEAKER: I have tried to look on the website and I do have a question, is there a list or a map of these regions broken down somewhere? Because obviously I don't know who all is in

my region and it is kind of tough to talk about what would be beneficial when I'm not really sure exactly who all is in the region.

>>SPEAKER: There is, but apparently we hide it and so we will try to do a little bit better on that.

>>SPEAKER: If you go to the list of standards aboard numbers, they list under each of your names what region you are in.

>>SPEAKER: Any other comments on that? We are easy to figure out. Region six is very easy to figure out. Is once a year a good cadence or would you prefer more or less often?

>>SPEAKER: We just wanted to say region four was conferring over here and we would prefer to me at region six in December! (LAUGHTER).

>>SPEAKER: Sir, I will let you know! From here to Houston and Houston to Honolulu is eight hours and a two hour layover and then seven hours to Guam. Come on down!

>>SPEAKER: You come to Michigan in December! (LAUGHTER).

>>SPEAKER: Have the helicopter ready.

>>SPEAKER: The ocean is very blue!

>>SPEAKER: One more geography fun fact. We learned at the region six meeting for the northern Marianas, the northernmost island has a few voters and they do not have a landing strip and so your option for getting there is a 21 hour boat ride one way and so think about that when you are serving voters challenges!

>>SPEAKER: How would you like to be that election day troubleshooter? Go, go, go!

>>SPEAKER: So, if it is not the boat ride it is a \$15,000 helicopter ride for a couple of voters.

>>SPEAKER: And for the record for region six, almost 9500 miles straight line distance from the US Virgin Islands - and that is the shortest way around the globe.

>>SPEAKER: Okay, getting together in person can be challenging with all of her other commitments we have during the year. The EAC has convened in person and virtual meetings in the recent past. Recognizing that it is already April, would you find it helpful for the EAC to facilitate an in person meeting in your region this year? What about virtual meetings? Would it be helpful if the EAC facilitated regular virtual meetings for standard board regions?

>>SPEAKER: Greg from Kentucky. I think in person meetings are generally better, because I think a lot of business gets conducted at a watercooler time and in the elevators and stuff like that and a lot of business gets conducted you know off the record and you know I think that is where you get a lot of ideas and things like that. So, you do not get that on a zoom meeting.

>>SPEAKER: This is Paul from Florida and I would say also if you are looking at more frequency and just sort of generally getting to know everyone in your region certainly a virtual meeting would be helpful. And if somebody really wanted to meet quarterly or twice a year or whatever I can see one of those being, but certainly you do lose some of the important value of being physically together and being able to hash things out and chat about things off-line.

>>SPEAKER: I know what I'm doing and meeting from my desk it is hard not to attend to other business while that is happening.

>>SPEAKER: How much lead time would you need? Ideally to attend an in person or virtual meeting?

>>SPEAKER: We were notified of our regional meeting and it was rather quickly and I mean it was a pretty short lead time and obviously you are dealing with fewer to organize and we were still in the thick of the general, but we knew it was coming and it is like okay, reserve this day

and then we got through our work, but it was less time that was needed to arrange than this one, obviously because there were fewer regional meetings. And so I don't know that we need and in my face it did not take a lot of time.

>>SPEAKER: This is Catherine from Maryland. I think that with just the EO, whatever is coming out with the EO and whatever feedback the EAC would like to have, I think there's more value in a in person meeting with at the timeline, you know? And how much notice we need but I think this is critical and it will make or break 2026.

>>SPEAKER: I think that is a fair point just given if it is a regularly scheduled meeting, I personally would love three months, especially being in December I was like oh, I'm try to juggle the time off I had scheduled and some other office commitments.

>>SPEAKER: You know I was thinking about with the executive order in front of us, one of the things is this needs to be dealt with almost immediately, but you know all with 112 of us I think having one more standards aboard meeting to address specifically that and then breaking out in the different regions so that we can ask the questions that are common to us within the region and you know that may help us deal with it. And I don't know if it is a premature option, but again, you know even between (NAME) was only a half hour away and I call her all the time to talk about issues, even talking with her and talking with Kayla, it is difficult to surmise what is the next step. We both have boards that can guide us through the policy and guide us through doing what we should be doing to again you know promote the honest and fair elections and make sure that anybody that votes is qualified to vote. But - and you know as we just had a board meeting and one of the things that I was directed to do was make sure that all of the questions that Guam has is given to the commissioners, the EAC commissioners to be addressed as soon as we can address it. Because, we have already started working on implementing what the executive order is stating. We also have started talking to our senator to find out what the environment is like to be able to address the different sections of the Executive Order. As we continue to prepare for 26. One of the requirements of the Guam election commission in our Guam law is to prepare an election comparative analysis report for every odd year, this report is due to the legislature. That report includes and must include recommendations to update the election code.

We are thinking about how do we do that with the executive order above our heads.

>>SPEAKER: Are we good?

>>SPEAKER: I think we are good. All right, I am sure the commissioners will make a determination and be working with Brianna with what they are able to do and what we have resources for an time for and it is kind of on their plate now and they will let us know. There is a lot of value in it and we do appreciate it. That matters.

So, let's go ahead and take a break. Did you have another question? Did you have something? We will leave one more thing -

>>SPEAKER: Now and between the break I was just going to say thank you for the feedback again I know that we see the use of the regions and the breakouts and have appreciated both the opportunity to deep dive on some issues and hear from new voices or different voices in that capacity. And I think that if something that we will continue to explore with a caveat that certainly resources are a part of the equation. In the last several years we have seen the

agency have some significant increases which I think have resulted in a lot of the product that you see and we have been talking about which is great. It has been stagnant for a couple years and I don't know that I want to predict the forecast, but those things all are factored in and again certainly I recognize the value of the in person, but sometimes I think the virtual has to be an option whether that is resources or staff time you know to facilitate those. But, again, I think the feedback matters and is useful and we will do our best to accommodate as much as we can, because we really appreciate the information and feedback that we get out of these sessions, so thank you.

>>SPEAKER: Commissioner -

>>SPEAKER: Okay, let's take a quick break and we will reconvene at 2:45 PM.

(BREAK)

A.

>>SPEAKER: All right, if we could have everybody back to the room, next we have a discussion of the pilot program and I will now turn it over to EAC Sarah Brady and Vice Chairman Hicks that will lead the discussion alongside Adam Podowitz-Thomas.

>>SPEAKER: And I will actually turn it over to (NAME) before we go into it today.

>>SPEAKER: Okay, so very early on we just want to acknowledge that the EAC is aware of the second of order that we did discuss. The memorandum opinion associated with that is 120 pages and so please understand my team is still reviewing what that means. I think the consultation letters we are going to have to revisit and have not made a decision on how to proceed with that, but we will do so shortly and that decision and kind of path forward will be communicated via email though I will tell you now that consultation request specifically cites the executive order and instruction and so the anticipation is that we will withdraw the request for consultation there. But, keep in advisement your comments today from that formal consultation process under the Executive Order. And so I think that generally covers where we are at this moment, just wanted to give you a wink and to say that you know we know we know and I'm happy to take a quick question - yes, Commissioner Palmer just asked that we talked about the content of the order which is sections 2A and 2D of the Executive Order. 2A is what we talked about the consultation and the direction for the EAC to incorporate those documents are proof of citizenship requirements to the form and then 2D is requiring national voter accreditation act agencies to also require proof of citizenship when registering to vote. Everything else in the order is currently still active, but still subject to litigation. And if there are no questions I think there were some very tarts left out there and so I will leave you all -

>>SPEAKER: Mark Owens, I have a question. What always challenged in this specific court proceeding?

>>SPEAKER: The court specifically ruled on and I don't have in front of me and it was specifically challenging 7A and 7B which the court did not order a preliminary injunction on and one of those being the grants provision - can I - and so 7A and 7B were challenging that as the ballot deadline. And were not preliminarily enjoined and so I'm not trying to overly simple thought, but for non-attorneys that does not necessarily mean the court is still considering it, it just means that it was not subject to the preliminary injunction.

And then I'm sorry 2B was also challenged which is directing federal agencies to provide access to information systems for voter registration systems and that was not preliminarily joined meaning that those agencies are directed to information sharing. Currently. And we are happy to circulate the order around as public information and so if I missed something from this quick recap I'm happy to provide further clarification.

>>SPEAKER: My main question I want to make sure the machine part was not challenged if I remember correctly.

>>SPEAKER: Correct. The entirety of the order is subject to litigation, but not within the preliminary injunction, that was not challenged. All right. Back to the regularly scheduled programming, thank you, everybody.

>>SPEAKER: All right, back to regularly scheduled programs. So, as Dag briefly touched on we are going to be starting the session here today with an overview of a recent EAC pilot project on voter list maintenance. This pilot study specifically explore the potential use of third-party credit data for voter lists maintenance and as a formal official who conducted my own fair share of voter list maintenance I really appreciated the feedback that we received from both state and local officials from their experiences and participating in the pilot. Today we wanted to share some of the highlights and key takeaways that we have captured in an upcoming report on the pilot. Then we will transition to the commissioners opening up the session for a broader discussion around voter registration and list maintenance where we would love to hear your thoughts and feedback on the topic. So, with that I will go ahead and hand it over to Adam for a brief presentation, thank you.

>>ADAM PODOWITZ-THOMAS: Good afternoon, everyone. So, as Sara was referencing I'm sure most of you have heard about this pilot study in some format prior to this meeting and that some meeting that the EAC has held and you all should have received the report in your email and if you do not see it leaves let us know so we can get you a copy because those are some things that we to do under HAVA and is considered on our feedback before and so please take your time to review it and we will give you highlights today to make sure you are all aware of what the report says. The pilot study concluded last year in following data review and analysis we are ready to talk through the graph report and what it concluded and we will provide you some of the top line data so you know what it says. Most of this is probably not going to be surprising to you all and it will feel like data that you maybe would have guessed is the case, but we find that there is a lot of values in truths that we think we know but actually getting data behind.

So, briefly without going into a ton of details, the pilot study included five local jurisdictions in civic states and those pilot jurisdictions were on boarded by experience and provided training and they were able to provide some set of voters from the list and so different jurisdictions took different approaches and some of them ran their whole voter list and some picked certain subsets for exam on may be they are in active force and they were able to send that information to Experian and the state boards were permissible they provided date of birth and an algorithm to provide matching and a new file for this pilot jurisdictions that provided potentially new addresses for some set of those voters.

Additional details just so you all are aware, they provided training for the jurisdictions in the EAC picked up the cost for those pilot study participants. And then as I was saying earlier we are going to be submitting this draft report to Congress under HAVA after any feedback you will provide. Final point before we get to the data which is the fun part, I do and to emphasize that at no point did the EAC actually received the voter files. So, this was a direct exchange between the pilot jurisdictions and Experian, at no point did we have that data. Moving onto the findings. Within those 11 pilot jurisdictions, little bit more than 11 million addresses were cemented to Experian.

Within those 11 million, about 74 or 75% ended up being verified as the most up-to-date address. So, that is the address that the voter list file included was the exact same address that Experian believed was the most up-to-date address for those voters. We are going to talk about the 11% that cannot be matched in just a second. The 15% is the number of new addresses that Experian was able to find and that is an average across all of the jurisdictions, but jurisdictions had a range of new addresses as low as 7% and as high as 22% of the list that was run ended up resulting in new addresses.

As I was saying earlier most addresses were already accurate. The range was 7 to 22% for jurisdictions that's omitted more than 10% of their voter list. And talking a little bit about and I had mentioned which set they wanted to run and for a jurisdiction that wanted to separate out there in active voters and active voters, they ran those as two separate lists through Experian and for the inactive list they ended up receiving a 39 almost 40% new address rate. Compared to their hit rate of 11.75% for the active list and so what really start differential between the inactive voters in the active voters. Another jurisdiction that submitted a much smaller list of its voters and suspected addresses were probably not right actually ended up with a 98% had rate. And so a 98% rate of that list resulted in new addresses. And so all of that is suggestive of the fact that this may be a particularly useful tool for voters that are on your roles that you already know are inactive and have not acted with them for a while and have not showed up to the polls. Potentially a use case there.

Going back to that 11% that we were talking about of no match for, there is actually outside research that suggests about 10 or 11% of Americans have no credit history within any of the major credit bureaus and that is quite interesting that the 11% that we ended up seeing in our pilot study is almost a perfect match for the number of voters that are not in credit Bureau data.

One statewide jurisdiction that participated ended up finding that 82% of its voters had some sort of touch point with Experian 's data within the last six months and so quite recent and a really really high percentage. We think that it is more than likely that that more recent data is probably good like it is a recent interaction of the voters address with Experian and we think it is more likely to be an up-to-date address.

Just keeping track of my notes. Right so voters with recent touch points of new addresses or those recent touch points ended up hitting about a 12% match rate and so 12% of those recent interactions resulted in new addresses which is also pretty close to the average move rate

across the United States on a yearly basis and so again validating outside data suggesting that this is capturing good new addresses for folks.

Last thing that own to cover quickly on this slide is that in one state the data did show that there was a correlation between ZIP Codes with higher percentages of certain racial and ethnic categories and so African-American, American Indian and other categories and so using Census Bureau categories with higher new address hit rates. And so those particular populations look like we get more new addresses out of those. Similarly and again probably not surprisingly ZIP Codes with really high rental rate also had much more frequent hits and so if you had populations in the area that were frequent movers you would have hit within the Experian data and also a correlation within the higher address rate with the ZIP Codes for either really young voters or really old voters. And some middle age voters, not a lot of new hits, but the younger and older voters we see a lot of new hits.

Additional considerations about the pilot study outlines or that the report outlines for folks, most jurisdictions that report on the study did not end up doing list maintenance that they see from Experian. There were a lot of reasons for that. Part of that was the timing of the pilot study and you all my remember that while we are running the election last year, things are very busy and you had a lot of things on your plate. There is obviously also legal implications with the NVRA quiet time and whether you are able to engage in large portions of last year.

There is also lack of clarity for some states as to whether they are even permitted to use this data and so some folks participated with the intention of gathering it as information and they wanted to see how good it was and maybe they are going to legislators to talk about potential future changes to the law.

We held a number of feedback sessions that were a part of the pilot study and they in those feedback sessions noted that they found the data received from this tool is very useful and in fact they compared it to data runs that they had done with other data sources like the NCO a and said that we actually found this as useful if maybe not more subtle and many of them use - a number of them described as a useful tool in their toolbox and so folks were not necessarily proposing that this is the solution to all of the voter list maintenance problems, but this is another data source for us to use in efforts to keep our roles clean.

There were some concerns about jurisdictions expressed about data quality, particularly related to changes in last names and Soso if somebody change their name when they got married or divorced it is not great at if Experian was capturing those folks and minor changes in street names and for example 1 of the jurisdictions that was given to us related to a voter that was registered at a street C view and Experian returned as one word and so some of those new addresses may not be real new contact information for voters.

The other concern that jurisdictions expressed about data quality was with UOCAVA voters and additional research is needed and we need to perform additional research to really do a deep dive on the cost benefit analysis of this data, particularly compared to other data sources

currently used for voter list maintenance such as the NCOA and jurisdictions felt that the new information derived would help with nondeliverable ballots.

There are numerous policy and implementation considerations and jurisdictions suggesting anybody is interested that we should think about first and so for example, how does the data from Experian or any other credit Bureau integrate with your already existing voter registration software or database? Which sets of data from voters you would like to submit and so should it be your inactive or your whole list or some other subset of your voters? As well as other considerations related to legal applications that we discussed earlier. So, in summation, the pilot study suggested third-party credit Bureau data to determine new or best addresses for voters may be an additional useful tool for election officials this maintenance processes. Jurisdictions that render voter list through FEC true trace product results that range from 10 to 22% new address of digitally providing a list of voters that election voters can reach out to update their addresses and I just want to emphasize that you will have the report, please take a moment and read it and give us feedback and we are really interested in hearing what you have to say and we will consider that feedback before we end up finalizing the report and sending it to Congress. And I'm happy to answer questions about the report either now or at the end of the panel, you can find me in the hallway. And unless there are any pressing concerns I'm happy to pass it over to the chairman and vice chair.

>>SPEAKER: I just had a question about the data itself and this is Paul from Florida and I gave my report to my staff numbers who deal with most of our list maintenance issues and we use accurate (SP?) which is sort of quasi- credit reporting among other things and what we see a lot of times is the activity date that six-month you know touch point that you're talking about is wrong and for whatever reason and they showed me a set of data where she knows for a fact that this person lives in Texas and the last activity date from the credit research is from a Florida address where they do not live anymore. And so did you see a lot of that or did you check for that you know with that high number of touch points you know was that something that you saw that was an issue, as well?

>>ADAM PODOWITZ-THOMAS: We did hear from some that were able to do an in-depth review of the data that there were discrepancies related to issues or similar - and so for example one pilot study jurisdiction reference a voter that moved from Memphis, Tennessee to a jurisdiction that participated, but I think that was like 10 years ago is my recollection and the voter - Experian still showed that voter in Tennessee and so certainly we saw some errors and there was a number of reasons for that I think we all know that people will get bills for folks that do not live in our houses or will get a credit card application for somebody that has not lived in that house for 10 years and so I'm imagining that is probably the source of some of those inaccuracies, but that was something that we saw in the pilot study, as well.

>>SPEAKER: And to your point the participating jurisdictions are still taking a look at that now and that was really a part of their kind of post review and doing some of that deeper analysis, thank you for sharing that.

>>SPEAKER: So, thank you, first of all for the presentation on the pilot and you know we got a lot of positive feedback from the states and localities that participated and there is a chance that we may continue with some research in this area and this is an example of how I am hopeful that the commissioners are hopeful that we can do some research and study ways to

improve list maintenance and I think another tool in the toolbox is one way of looking at it. And I sort of got the impression in my interactions with it that it really was NCOA that has issues sometimes and I called it NCOA on steroids because you have problems with additional commercial data and so I felt that it really helped us conduct and confirm and address changes in location that we were able to follow up with the voter in a more regimented way.

Before we go on I think that some of the questions that we can start off with some questions and we would love to get your feedback and if you would use this data or just general issues that you would may be having with list maintenance and just to get started if anybody wants to talk about their challenges, what are the significant challenges that you face in maintaining registration lists and what tools do you find helpful or most valuable in list maintenance? And if there's anybody that wants to talk about their challenges - I am sure there is not many, are there?

>>SPEAKER: Commissioner, this is Beth Thompson from New Jersey. And I have been working with Experian since 2018 and we do use it as a tool, as an investigative tool and so what a great job the post office does with delivering sample ballots and things that come back no such street, no deliverables etc. And so we use that during each cycle when those stickers come back yellow with no information on it, we have been using Experian just to see if there is a new updated address that we can contact and it has been an excellent tool. Cost wise for a small County like mine, it is about \$30 a month for this subscription and we got on board with it in 2018 and it has been an invaluable tool.

>>SPEAKER: So, use the term investigatory and that is like you have some indication that this person may be gone, but you don't know?

>>SPEAKER: Exactly.

>>SPEAKER: When you say small -

>>SPEAKER: We have about 100,000 voters and so we are pretty small, it was just we started as kind of like a pilot program, but we took it on, because we were finding that tools like holistic data were not available to us and the list of data was not working and we adopted it in our county and like I said, we have used it since 2018 and you will find that there are a lot of people that do not have credit, just like what you said and so we do find that you know really when a person moves and they have a new address and it definitely does help you find people that you would not have known where they were and this saves you a lot of time and effort you know contacting them saying hey, if you registered in a new state, we will send you a card and you can sign and cancel and it has really been a great tool.

>>SPEAKER: One more follow-up question. So, something that I got as feedback is that sometimes the communication between Experian and the election officials, the election official, there was a learning curve of what is the data providing me and how can I use it to my advantage? Did you have a learning curve with this in sort of getting the data and how you're going to use it?

>>SPEAKER: It was really very easy and you basically had a side to side comparison that you're putting in your relative data from your statewide voter registration system and it does help if you have ID in that voters profile if you have a driver's license or the last four digits it does not require you to have the full ID and to have a correct date of birth. If you are missing something about that voter pertaining to ID, it is not going to help you at all. So, that was really the caveat

and then again we found that young people, 18-year-olds to 23 and sometimes do not have established credit and those were the ones that were missing the most information on.

>>SPEAKER: Nick Lima from Rhode Island. And so this really is in my interest because one of the biggest problems that we have when investigating or researching voter address issues is that really there is no authoritative authority for us to trust. I have got one street in my jurisdiction that is called Main Street, but if you go to Google's maps it is called four different things and all of them are wrong and the poor voters who live on that street, they do not get mail from USPS it is a non delivery zone and so you know any commercial database that you look at, it does not even acknowledge the existence of those houses and street address numbers that are assigned by the city and recognized by the city and recognized by nine on one site data, but as far as commercial entities are concerned, they physically do not exist and they and not order pizza and that is a real problem for us and we struggle with that and that is true in Rhode Island and most places, the municipalities are the ones assigning house numbers or creating street names and there is not a great mechanism for us to communicate that out to the commercial agencies or even to USPS which sometimes takes way longer than they are supposed to to recognize and update their own systems in the case for deliverable areas, too.

>>SPEAKER: Yes, Tom?

>>SPEAKER: Tom from New York. Did you guys look anything aside from getting new address data, credit bureaus that do apparently track people who die and prevent credit fraud? And so have you ever looked at that for a possible source for that kind of list maintenance?

>>SPEAKER: So, I don't think we did. It is available and I do know jurisdictions have used it and it has been a useful tool and I do know some states even with Experian that use it, but we did not focus on that I don't believe.

>>SPEAKER: That is correct. For this pilot. That was not included.

>>SPEAKER: That was the address update part of that and it is an offering and they do provide that information.

>>SPEAKER: And just to supplement that, if it is of interest for folks, Experian also offers commercial indicators so you can determine whether an address is commercial vs. Residential if that is of help in any way.

>>SPEAKER: Mark - we do use the experience for the death list and we have found it to be beneficial. I am not going to say that we have found tons of individuals on that list but some that we had missed through the process and we also use it for the commercial indicator, but you still have to be careful because of colleges and those things. So, I do give you that caveat and we also use list data, both Experian and Melissa data and we have found some better with each one and so using both together it has been beneficial for us.

>>SPEAKER: One thing of interest is I found and we have sort of used different times NCOA and commercial and a mix and FEC incorporates it into their product and so in the end there may be some savings.

No comments?

>>SPEAKER: Any other comments on that?

>>THOMAS HICKS: I was just thinking about the list maintenance issue and trying to figure out what states actually do prefer list maintenance overall. And so hopefully this pilot was

helpful for folks in the as you get the report last night to read through that before we send it out to Congress. So -

>>SPEAKER: One follow-up question and go ahead -

>>SPEAKER: Did not mean to interrupt you. Just an initial thought for you. And kind of going back to your presentation from earlier this afternoon you know I would encourage the EAC to continue to do these types of initiatives and using your authority under the federal government helps encourage voters and being trustworthy in the process. In the state of Washington, one of the tools that has not come up yet and may be something that Secretary Bellows in Maine or Michigan has a little bit more experience with, but the Department of licensing has an inner state that is called state to state and it is very creative, but I think it's title is indicative of what it does, but essentially my understanding of that process is that if a individual receives a ID credential, the Department of licensing in the state of Washington and the Department of motor vehicles and other states, those states exchange that information. I do not understand what the frequency of that information is, but one of the challenges that an election official faces is the timeliness of some of these, because they are actually crucial in states that have registered and deadlines that are mind that are closer to election day and the frequency in which the Department of licensing agencies exchange that information can be beneficial in identifying if your state has a good relationship with your local Department of licensing of identifying something that was mentioned earlier and the indication of a move and you don't know exactly where they have moved and so I wanted to bring that to your attention, Commissioner Palmer as a challenging additional tool.

>>SPEAKER: I agree and thank you for that comment. And I will make a couple statements and please, I know states that use this already and in my discussions with ANVA and I was asking how the EAC can help facilitate this process and really it was explained to me at NASS that it really is a state to state communication and agreement and it is periodic and not every DMV or licensing agency has lines of communication with their election office or speaking directly to what their needs are. And some are more accommodating than others and so I guess the bottom line is that relationship is really important between DMV and the election office and you know we like this data and in a regular manner and if you talk to legislature, (INDISCERNIBLE) it is always helpful. And I have inquired before is there a way to facilitate that, but ANVA encourages me that that is their job to facilitate and so it really will come down to you developing that relationship with the drivers license agency that we would like this out-of-state notification data that other states - Secretary Bellows? I had a suspicion that you may raise your hand.

>>SPEAKER: We appreciate EAC willingness to work at the national level and I think that is important especially in smoothing the policy questions and helping Congress think through it. And so we just going to state to state and how it works is when somebody moves to Maine and they are getting a license in Maine, it is the idea is one license, one person, right? And so we claim that license for the other states. And we also implemented my first year in my first term what we call automatic voter registration which for my red state friends probably is a different name, but it is motor voter, but electronically and so when people come to the Bureau of motor vehicles, if they are a citizen and we are verifying legal status, if they are a citizen, then ask them if they would like to register to vote. And if they are moving, because people do not call their clerks when they move, but they go to the DMV, we call it the Bureau.

And so we did automatic voter registration at the DMV to increase voter registration. But, the side benefit of it, especially for those intra-state move has been a huge list maintenance benefit. We have been able to really clean up our roles in that way, because we are capturing when people move and to your point and I think this is an excellent point, Stuart that when they are coming from another state, then suddenly we are claiming their license and it feels like that creates a potential mechanism and we have not implemented it yet, but it is a really good idea of letting the registrar in their home state know that we have claimed the voting registration as well. And I don't know if our laws permit it yet, but it is a really intriguing idea, because it is a system that is always on. And so it is not that it is a notification on that person, it is when that person is showing up in front of the DMV employee and hello, I have just moved to Maine, we are claiming that license for that person and we are automatically notifying the other states where that person may have a credential and it should be just one state now (CHUCKLE) and we are all working on making sure that there are not duplicates and we work on resolving those duplicates. And it may be a way to streamline the process and also has the benefits of list maintenance and I will just say the traditional list maintenance efforts under the NVRA, we did a old-fashioned mailing and it helped us remove a significant portion of voters who had moved you know for any reason should not have been on our list. So - we should not throughout the old with the new. Or the safeguards that exist in the old, because of course we did that postcard mailing if folks want to vote in the subsequent federal election, they had not been purged, they had just been inactivated and could not be reactivated by virtue of showing up.

>>SPEAKER: One of the things that we do in Nebraska is that we have done this for several years now and we found it incredibly beneficial to get the surrender drivers licenses from other states. I did not realize that it was not every state that participated and so that is good to know. 47 states participate. But, it has been highly beneficial and one of the things we had to work through at the beginning of this process with the DMV is to confirm and we did not want drivers licenses that were surrendered to another state due to a change of state of residence, not for so many years of voluntarily surrendering their drivers license or a revoked driver's license and being very clear like when you give us this specific data, it really needs to be a change of state of residence for us to act. And then we basically have proof that you have in fact moved to that other state and you have signed documents in the other state saying that you have moved and we have gotten that data. So -

>>THOMAS HICKS: Great, great. We only have a few minutes left, but we wanted to ask a couple of questions about public communication. And so one of the things that we wanted to find out is what strategies have you found to be most useful and successful to help voters understand how list maintenance works and why voters are or are not routinely removed from the roles? Do you need me to repeat the question? No, Ben. What strategies have you found most helpful to voters for how list maintenance works -

>>SPEAKER: I was going to add a little context on this, as well. As we looked at and I think we learned a decent amount from this pilot with the Experian data and obviously from our perspective we are not doing list maintenance, but at the national level, the ability to take on some of these things and hopefully save 50 states from having to do this work or thousands of jurisdictions from considering it and in getting that shared benefit and I think similarly on this you know something that we have kicked around a little bit is can we do a pilot or study around

outreach or language that can be used to educate voters about you know so many voters assume that their address gets updated or assume that their voter registration gets updated. And so are there other elements that we can look at to assist the voter or list maintenance process or validate statistically that certain processes are more effective and more efficient ultimately to save Resources.

>>SPEAKER: And Commissioner, Paul in Florida again I would say probably one of the most useful things is every chance you get when talking to civic organizations is to talk about you know yes, there is a process and I always describe for them the idea here that NVRA is a double-edged sword, we make it easier to get people to register by allowing you to do it at libraries and post offices and getting your drivers license and all of that, but then there is the other side which is we have to go through the process so if you are not participating and you are not communicating with us that we do not keep you forever and all eternity as a voter in our jurisdiction, because we cannot. And when you explain to most organizations and when we explained to most people you know the process itself, the lightbulb comes on and they are like oh, well, that makes sense and we are not just like sorry we did not vote one time and so we take out the voter role, too bad. And they understand the process and a lot of the people that I in my jurisdiction would like the process to move faster and of course it is a deliberative process on purpose and so they are entitled to not like it, but that is just what it is. But, it really truly, once you explain to them the sort of why of the process and then they understand better and then you can usually turn a lot of those people into advocates for you, as well which is helpful.

>>SPEAKER: We can probably wrap up with this last question. We have done this research and used the third-party data and you know there are other areas obviously with voter registration systems and any areas of list maintenance that you would hope the EAC would do some additional research or research on that may be helpful to assist with a list maintenance that we are not thinking of?

>>SPEAKER: Now is the chance to talk about your states and how great you do list maintenance point there we go.

>>SPEAKER: I will just add one more thing, we report to legislature every year on list maintenance and it is called our central voter registration report, but it is not just list maintenance, it is new registrants and the work we are doing on voter registration and also the list maintenance work. So, it is an objective year after year after year comparative and historical data about what we are doing and that creates some may say well Secretary Valdes, that is objective, but there are others that have done this same report and you can see year after year what has happened. And that is helpful in going back in looking historically.

>>SPEAKER: Part of getting credit of what you do is to put it out there, right?

>>SPEAKER: True, exactly. And we are proud of our list maintenance efforts and I'm happy to talk about that with anyone.

>>SPEAKER: Online is also healthy because it is true for everybody and true with students, students move every year if they are on a university campus and they especially may not be telling the election clerk until they update their voter penetration that sometimes the back and get messy and so online voter registration again is actually having - is great for voting rights, but it is also great for list maintenance.

>>SPEAKER: The transient community that comes with a university in your town is always a difficult one, especially during a presidential election cycle, because the assignment gets built

and this year and then giving back out of the roles is the other probably one of our most difficult issues -

>>THOMAS HICKS: More so than not it is probably their first election.

>>SPEAKER: It is and we tried to come up with as many ideas and Franken County and I mean we put a QR code so they did not have to go so it would take them directly to the Secretary of State site and they can register right there, but I think the confusion from the college campuses particularly you know it would be nice to have something to explain to the college campuses you know because I can go up there and you have a limited amount of their time and/or attention. And you can explain that once you register here in Franklin County you are no longer registered in Michigan or you no longer can vote in your hometown and I think it probably - if you lose especially a influential child that wants to vote and is excited, if you lose them because of list maintenance issues, you will lose a voter and I mean it shows, if they show up and they cannot do it - what they are excited to do, you will not get them back for four, five, eight, 10 years and so I would like to see us do something and I just have a problem that I don't have an answer, but with the college communities.

>>SPEAKER: It is a tough nut. And even the recorders and supervisors that go on campus that have access and provide the information you know it sometimes is difficult to get through. Until 20 days before the election.

>>SPEAKER: If I could add something, this is Mandy from New Mexico and I think related to strategies my comment would be that there are many ways to get at list maintenance and you know it feels like the more tools we have access to the better we are going to be at it and so I would just encourage from a messaging perspective the idea that you know online voting registration and same-day voter registration and automatic voter registration, those are all policies that support list maintenance and so being able to put those in the same category I think from a messaging perspective is helpful and that would be helpful I think from states and locals and asking your support in messaging in that same way and then I did have a question specifically on the Experian tool on just getting clarity and may be off-line on what is the cost associated. And then lastly I learned a little bit yesterday during the workshop that I was able to participate in with some of you here today that there may be some misunderstandings towards another tool that a lot of us utilize and Eric (SP?) being that tool and so to anybody interested or wants to learn a little bit more about that, I will extend an offer to share information. But, ultimately there is some new ways to tackle this and I think the more the better.

So, just continuing to share the information is helpful.

>>SPEAKER: I don't have the answer on the cost and you know I think that my experience in the Commonwealth of Virginia and you know it was not Experian, but using an additional vendor that had the additional monies for example for statewide NCOA, the cost of the additional commercial data was negligible from a statewide perspective. But you know I think orange county California and some of their studies have identified the cost to them and they have obviously incorporated the savings that they had on the mailings from the voter guides and list maintenance. And it helped and then reduced the cost of their mailings which was a significant burden on their office which will have a cost. And so in their analysis they really saved them money even though my experience was that it did not seem like it was a huge additional cost, it was very negligible at the state level.

And it is a product that they sell and you would have your own you know in our pilot it is one that uses the particular product and it is a portal that you have directly with them and their staff and so I cannot speak to the actual cost on a monthly or you know every six months or however often you would use it and I think that when you incorporate it into your processes it is something that you would have to budget for.

>>THOMAS HICKS: Well, I want to say thank you everybody for the discussion today and we do appreciate your time and I do think that this helps EAC become a little bit better. Anything else? To give us a better idea of how the EAC can help support you. And as you know as we still have another day and a lot more time, the conversation does not need to stop here. And so always feel free to touch base with us or others on this topic and with that I will turn it back over to you, Dag.

>>DAG ROBINSON: Thank you Commissioner Hicks. And I might just add one more thing. Oregon was the first day in the country to go with automatic voter registration through DMV. And it did not and does not come without challenges for us. And I would let the secretary that if you wanted to, but we don't have the luxury that Secretary Bellows has and I learned recently that we did have that relationship and we can see that little bit better, but it is better for list maintenance and wonderful to keep track of voters for the most part, but we do have our own challenges and some of you have brought those up. So, in any case, I will leave you with that.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Dag.

>>SPEAKER: So, our final panel of the day will include discussion of election official training and a update on the EAC learning lab. I would like to recognize Ed G, subject matter expert of EAC that will lead a discussion on election official trainings.

>>ED: All right, good afternoon, everyone, this is the last panel of the day and we'll try to make it as engaging as possible to send you off into your late afternoon and evening. Thank you again to Dag and for those of you that participated in the EAC ideas lab yesterday you would recognize me from there and if not this may be my first time meeting you and I am relatively new here at the EAC. I am excited to be talking about the election official training and specifically about the EAC learning lab. Honestly I'm joined by three esteemed panelists and I am very excited to hear their thoughts and about their training programs that are very successful and excellent models to us here at the EAC and to all. And before that we will be spending about 10 minutes giving you an update on the state of training here at the EAC. Again that is inclusive of both in person and online efforts and again we will learn about the three states represented up here on this panel and then we will hear and have a discussion about what I'm hoping to engage with all of you and to engage in a multimodal training program and online etc. leveraging the experience of you all in talking about how EAC efforts can complement your own training programs.

So, with that, jumping into the learning lab, we are very proud to have launched the learning lab and the soft launch was in September of 2024 and the learning lab offers a wide series of trainings covering foundational election administration concept and things and trainings that are on-demand so that they can be accessed by anyone at any time or any election official at any time I should say that are accessible to not only the official, the registrar, clerk, etc., but also to staff in your offices. We know that offering free training and be a way to get those folks that are

in your office, maybe you have got folks coming in and this can help quickly get them up to speed on foundational election administration concepts that are applicable across the country. So, universal concepts, foundational concepts and practical training for folks. For example, our effective poll worker training module does not say exactly what should be trained to get poll workers up to speed, but it explains how to train poll workers in an engaging way that respects their time and acknowledges how adult learners learn best. So, we are not trying to be a prescription for all things, we are certainly trying to fill in the gaps and provide complement retraining through the efforts that you are all undertaking in your states.

So, to visualize this we can watch a segment here from our effective poll worker training and let me play this -

(VIDEO PLAYING)

(AWAY FROM MIC)

So, here again we are not trying to get into the details of exactly what to train, we are talking about how and why it is important to train poll workers and again they are in the specific case they are talking about the main people that our main touch points that many voters have and effectively training them is critically important.

You can see on the handout and on the screen right now what is currently available in the learning lab and we are proud to have 25 training modules currently available and you will also see on the slide here and on the handout that a number of these are offered in person as well communicating about elections with public, accessibility and I will touch on the crossover between our online training efforts and in person training efforts a little bit later in this presentation.

We have a number of upcoming and by the summer I expected that we will have something like 33 training modules in the learning lab and here is what you can see and what you can expect and again, a couple of in person training crossovers and contingency management and audit communication transparency.

We are now up to a little bit over 300 users across the country and I'm happy to tell you that this slide is already out of date and I created it shortly before the LLC annual meeting and before you all were in the room, as well and we now have a couple of additional states represented and we are working on our goal of having users in all 50 states and I think we are getting quite close to it. And again, just to flag that we have only launched the program in September 2024 and so we are growing rapidly and we are really trying to promote this training platform as an accessible way to gain access to free and applicable training.

So, I encourage you to consider also the ways that EAC learning lab training content can be couple mentoring to the efforts that are underway in your states and there are 15 total hours of training right now and there are a few states that have engaged with us to help amplify the

training content and offer it to election officials within their states and while it precedes the learning lab, Florida and the election program there that I'm excited to hear more about from Paul offered credit for viewing EAC content in 2020 and then very recently the state of Connecticut and the Association there has been interested in offering credit to election officials that the learning lab content in New Jersey and we were happy to work with and I see them waving in the back, we were happy to work with them to extend the accessibility series and to talk about learning lab training with their election officials recently and in Idaho we were fortunate to be at a in person training with the state election office ran and afterwards we came up with opportunities to continue to promote learning lab content during the regional trainings that are ongoing this year.

If you have not already joined, this is the QR code and a link so that you can do so and I certainly encourage you to do so and again, this is a really exciting development for the EAC and I am personally very excited about this as a former election official from the state of Michigan where there are 1600 election officials and all with varying degrees of access and resources the training and the fact that this offers a no-cost option, completely on-demand would have been and is in my previous experience a very useful thing. So, I am happy to be able to share with you about it today.

Onto our in person training, we like the learning lab content are trying as much as possible to offer something that is universally applicable, practical and offering foundational concepts and doing it in a interactive way, I think that is absolutely key and are in person trainings offer opportunities to collaborate and we acknowledge that sometimes the best educator and trainer, our fellows and peers and we try very hard to get folks talking within a room and sharing ideas and best practices, effective practices and offering a platform and foundation for that that again establishes you know a baseline of universal foundational concepts. And we have done trainings recently across the country and we are working on expanding those efforts and Commissioner Hicks this morning and his opening remarks mentioned that we have trained a little over 1100 election officials so far this year and no doubt there will be hundreds more in the coming months as we continue to work our way around the country and the regions.

During our in person trainings, again folks can expect to be engaged in small group and hands-on exercises and one of the exercises that I want to highlight is one that Kim Smith, my colleague put together it is a clue game and it is based on clue and it is a fun and engaging way to kind of solve the whodunit when thinking about chain of custody. So, it kind of models effective chain of custody practices at the same time and allows election officials to get hands-on and to do new work in a creative and engaging way.

Trainings that we offer our flexible and anywhere from 30 minutes to several hours and again focus on foundational concepts and so basic standard operating procedures to preparing for contingencies through developing of a coup to talk about postelection audits and all things in between.

As I mentioned earlier we are trying hard to leverage learning lab content in a crossover manner and that way we can offer similar content to what we are providing online in short format in person workshops and training environments in a way that allow for immediate takeaways for participants and encourage them to join the learning lab to continue their education in that accessible format. And these kinds of engagements like other engagements of that we are running offer supporting and offer support relationships between and among election officials and spark immediate engagement and idea sharing.

This is an example of some of the content that we present in our communicating with the public about elections in person training and one of the things that we highlight is some effective strategies to communicate during emergency or crisis and we lead to an example and discussing the importance of creating a holding statement. And I will tell you in my 20 years of election administration experience in Michigan, I have never heard of a holding statement before and this was a concept that was foreign to me but is an example of how we can leverage other disciplines including communications professionals who are certainly aware of what a holding statement is to offer effective strategies to election officials and a holding statement is simply a prepared statement that you can have ready in case of an emergency or crisis to communicate with the public that you are aware of the situation working to address it and provide an opportunity or information about when you will continue to engage with the public to understand what is going on.

So, one of the things that we do to really fit this nail and drive it home is to kind of walk through and in person opportunity to have fun and to do a little bit of mad Lib and if you have ever participated in a madly before you know the ideas that come out of it are rapid and exciting and engaging and so I want to walk you through one of these mad Lib experiences that we offer to election officials right now. With that I will now ask you all to follow me and offer up and I just want to throw it out from the crowd, tell me the name of a government office. Passports? Tax board? Time of day? Okay, noon? Type of incident? What? Activity? Roller-skating? And a common job or profession? Perfect. Members of the public. Girl Scouts. An expression of care or concern? There it is! A website? A location? And a time? 2 AM. Let's read to the mad Lib that you just created. And so at approximately noon the tax board was made aware of reports of a flood and we are working on the extent of the roller-skating and provide more details as we know what happened. The safety of our plumber and Girl Scouts are our first priority, bless your heart! As more information is available we will be providing updates through EAC.gov and regular media briefings. Note for the media briefings that will be held in Greenland at 2 o'clock in the morning.

All right, with that I am very excited to turn to our panelists and this is my contact information and if you want to talk more first before I move forward, if you want to talk about training opportunities, engagement, etc., feel free to contact me and talk to any of us clearinghouse folks or EAC folks here in the hallway, very happy to discuss how we can engage and complement what you are doing in your state. With that I will reintroduce our panelists and again we have got from my left, Paul Lux and Daniel Lee from the state of Idaho and Stuart Holmes and from the state of Washington and I am going to open or ask them to open by describing the training

program efforts that are underway in your states and we will start with Paul and go in order of states by alphabetical order.

>>PAUL LUX: So, this dance for Florida certified election professional and it was originally established in 2005 and took us four years to work out the curriculum and it was originally designed to be - because we have over half of our counties, 67 counties are small counties and we have very tight budgets and they cannot afford to participate in things like whatever the program used to be - I have not attended - and so those were just not cost effective and so we were looking for something that was more localized and more specific to Florida. So, what they created then were 30 core curriculum classes and I am not going to read them all off, but just to give you an idea of the broad scope of what the classes cover, we have classes about election law and voter registration and polling place management and budget development and canvassing board processes and candidate qualifying in public records management, stress and time management and a host of others. Every class is four hours long. And since it is underwritten, we have to meet the contact hours in order for the classes to maintain their structure. Where and when do we hold the classes? They tried to do as many as they can and obviously odd-numbered years, they rush in and do more classes and more locations and so for example this year we are going to be in Orlando, Tallahassee, Fort Myers and Palm Beach. And so it gives the counties, they don't need to get into a plane and fly anywhere, they can just get in their car and drive to most of these locations to attend these classes.

The teachers, the teachers can be almost anybody and typically we rely on what I will call field specialists and so although they may have a supervisor of elections, maybe they came to the supervisor's office via being a law enforcement officer or a public information officer somewhere and so those people will teach classes about law enforcement issues or you know public interactions and there are a number of lawyers and we have tried to limit them for obvious reasons and I am just kidding, especially to Maria to who I respect very much and then just SOE's that have a lot of expertise in a lot of fields and you know I happen to be one of the teachers and so you can see how far down the barrel they have had to go and I teach candidate qualifying and I teach the class on voting systems in knowing the ins and outs of the voting systems and these classes are really geared not just to broaden your general staff members knowledge, but also for new supervisors it is incredibly helpful to really give them a good foundation for being a successful supervisor of elections. And so you ask about 20/20 and why we were pushing everybody to your website for your training and the answer of course is that it is about the money. In Florida, we have a program that elected supervisors in each of the 67 counties can receive \$2000 in proficiency pay if they meet the annual hours for professional development. Now, most people get those contact hours by attending our two state conferences and we do a winter conference and a summer conference and usually those contact hours are enough to earn you your certification pay, but when you do not meet during COVID for example, how do you get those hours? And so everybody was desperately looking for anything and everything that they could receive credit for in the EAC offerings were absolutely fabulous and I remember Maria and I both were spending a lot of time emailing a lot of people about signing up for classes so they could receive all of the credit that they needed to get that certification payment that they are always looking for.

And it was not just that we had great content, but also a little bit of selfish reasoning there. And you know that is really the just of our program. They have moved on from the original program to the master certified Florida professional and that involves a renewal class that you have to take once every four years in order to renew it and so kind of like the Sarah classes where you have to go through a renewal course to keep that certification and so of course as each year goes by we have more and more Masters certified Florida elections personnel then we do just the regular ones, but just all of the classes, I am here to tell you that if they send you the email and say that we have open the registration for these classes, you better stop what we are doing and because the seats fill up really really fast and then they are closed and you have to wait for the next time around.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you very much. Daniel?

>>DANIEL LEE: For the state of Idaho, essentially the secretary state office is obligated by statute to train election officials across the state or county staff at least three times a year. Those trainings are not required for the county staff to attend, but it is required for state staff, for us to put it on at the Secretary of State office. And so the way it is kind of overseen and broken down is there is an annual statewide conference that we do to where all of the County clerks and their staff come to the center well, not center, but to Boise where we all meet in a conference and that conference is more of a higher field of learning and at that conference we review different things and have different presentations and different panels kind of like right here and what we are doing here. And we have discussions showcasing new tools across the state including usually including legislative dialogue and so we will invite different legislators to wear our County clerks can actually have a Q&A with the legislative people from the legislator related to elections and specifically that you can answer questions and refute your presentations from outside experts and for example we invited the EAC the past two years and two years ago Commissioner Hicks showed up and last year Commissioner Palmer had showed up. And their presentation was on the learning lab and it was taken really well from county officials and really helpful. And those other two trainings that we are obligated to do, the Secretary of State office, we do regional trainings where Secretary of State staff will travel to different parts of Idaho and different regions and so north, east and where we are located in South Idaho and the counties in those areas will go to those trainings where we are at and the learning there is more not a higher level, but more personal level where there is a lot more discussions happening. And so kind about those regional trainings we really kind of get into the nitty-gritty of things where we cover like legal requirements, legislative changes, if there were any legislative changes in the last legislative session and typically those regional trainings, they will be tailored to the specific year. So, if it is an election year they will be tailored very specifically to the election cycle and so training on different things relating to the election and if it is not like a presidential or primary year. Just an off year it would be tailored to that and yes - also at those regional training specifically we kind of introduced this the last time where there is peer led sessions and so instead of just the Secretary of State office leading the training the entire time and then the discussion we have actually had County clerks that have ran different things and sharing different ideas and running sessions specifically and so this last one, they specifically reviewed like auditing practices and we had Patty weeks, our representative here, she actually was able to review her auditing practices at Pierce County specifically and so different counties could kind of understand what Patty does specifically so they could maybe implement some of the ideas

that she has and the things that they do there. But, that is kind of the just of overall our training program that we do with our county officials.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Daniel and Stuart, we are on to you.

>>STUART HOLMES: My colleagues from Idaho and Florida, your guy's states actually look very similar and I don't know if you notice this, but Idaho is like the unfinished version of Florida if you just rotated on the slide I saw her earlier, just noted that. And what I would like to do, I included states in my presentation if you don't mind and are you ready for that? Okay, wonderful. I will start with you, Paul. And so the state of Washington established our election administration certification board following one of the worst elections of our lives. Did any of your certification programs come out of the 2000 election and from folder?

>>PAUL LUX: It was not a part of that.

>>STUART HOLMES: Prior to that? Well, we wanted our mistakes very fast and we had the 2004 gubernatorial election that was extremely close. And we took that information into our election certification now and so to become certified you have to have 80 hours of training over the course of two years and you must complete a test. We also require each attendee and it does not go towards their training accreditation, but they must attend an elections orientation class which we call V101 and now I would argue that Daniel this is so that people from Idaho that come to Washington and learn about our state laws. And the difference from Idaho. But, we do not steal your election administrators, I promise!

>>SPEAKER: Much appreciated!

>>SPEAKER: And so that is the fun a mental principal and the reason why the election administration certification board is so important is because it is not always written into statute, but requires the participation of our state legislature. And so on a yearly basis on our state elections conference we provide a briefing of all of the trainings that we have provided in all of the hours and training that each of our election officials have taken in the presence of members of the state legislature. Now, of course as you can imagine it does create an obstacle in making changes to the certification program, but I do think that it is an added benefit to include your state legislature in your certification program for the obvious awareness that that brings to that body.

We work very closely with our auditors Association as well to ensure that we are providing the coverage necessary for each of the two required certified election administrators at each County is required to have and be able to respond to any feedback that they have. For example in 2020 which was mentioned as far as the money is concerned, ensuring that each of our election admitted traders were trained and qualified required us to adapt slightly and so we now provide virtual and recorded trainings because of our smaller counties being reduced in size and because of the attendance in person is the closure of the elections office or the suspension of them being able to process ballot returns as they need to have two election administrators there and if they need to remain open, only one can leave.

Additionally we created a weekly training and it is a very short on the point training that we call election education days or ED talks and it allows us to make changes in the state legislature on a very quick and timely fashion for our election administrators and I will save you big presentations for the state conference which happens in June in which we will continue to invite

the EAC to attend and present to that, as well. But, that is the quick summary of the state of Washington and how we battle with the state of Idaho and have learned from Florida.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Stuart. Now I want to get a conversation going about developing successful multimodal training programs and I certainly invite everyone of you in the board to participate in this, but my first question is going to be for Paul. You just mentioned that there is often a waitlist to join the FCEP or participate in it. Why are election officials so eager to participate and what lessons they have?

>>PAUL LUX: I have of course already mentioned the money which for a lot of people is the overriding factor, but your staff is not getting that notice and staff want to be educated, as well. And I can see that there is a few avenues for that. Number one, they want to be better prepared because they are just as dedicated as their bosses are to ensure free and fair elections to make everything run smoothly and as we all know, right? I mean hands of everybody who has been to any sort of professional certification like Sarah or (NAME) or any of those, probably most everybody in the room. And so it is the professional relationships that you develop with people while you were going to those classes that become so much more valuable. And I continue with Sarah classes and the ones that want to can go to Podowitz-Thomas one classes and it is just building those relationships that people like hey, I remember talking with so and so about this and I don't member how they fixed it, but let me get them on the phone and you already have that face time and you already knows people and who to call and who to talk to and that truly is the benefit beyond the subject matter that you are covering to any type of program like this is just having that extra face time in making those professional relationships with like-minded people and sharing ideas with each other and learning from each other that is so vitally important to the success of all of these programs.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Paul. Daniel, Idaho Secretary of State office is required as you mentioned to provide training, but election officials are not required necessarily to take that training. How does the SOS motivate its officials to participate in training and how can we model those efforts?

>>DANIEL LEE: One of our top priorities is relationship building with our counties and it is really critical for us to have really good relationships with county officials and so I would say that with building those relationships with our county officials, supported by in person trainings and also we provide virtual Q&A sessions and so our Secretary of State and our staff there, they provide these virtual trainings to our county officials every so often where we will just get on a zoom call and anybody can show up from the different counties and ask any and all questions which opens up that dialogue between the County and the state to make sure that we are all on the same page all the time.

Also incising the importance of professional training has been successfully increased County participation and making sure that they understand like the importance of that professional training and then how can the EAC model on those efforts? I would say interactive formats like tabletop exercises, Q&A's like we do and virtual breakouts from the EAC can boost engagement and awareness of available resources.

>>SPEAKER: Fantastic, thank you, very much. Stuart, the state determines curriculum and so how do you decide what content to offer and the effectiveness of that?

>>STUART HOLMES: For the state of Washington we also require counties to go through reviews on a regular basis every five years or more frequent if resources are available from the legislature. And those reviews provide us boots on the ground perspectives of what is going on in the county and we will take any findings or best practices from those reviews and implement training programs around them whether it is a best practice that we would like everybody to know about or a regular finding that we see in multiple counties.

We also have a statewide voter management system to gather input and management related to the support tickets and also have a policy inbox where folks seek guidance on regular policy questions and those all will take the information put together and create a training program. It cannot be overstated enough that repetition of frequent trainings and consistency in those trainings is extremely important. Of course all of our states face turnover with election officials whether through retirements or just deciding that the administration is not for them and so these regular trainings on very critical tasks like chain of custody and like reconciliation are critical to your states success in a effective training program. And on that note I will also say that in order to be successful you need to understand the differences between a training and a teaching program. There is a reason why the phrase is teach a man to fish and not train a man to fish, I can train you to do pretty much anything, but if I teach you to do something, that is different, because now you understand perhaps why we are doing that teaching in counties like I was mentioning earlier that are smaller that staff have perspective in the process, but when I go to my largest counties, that staff member may just know how to move that sheet of paper from that side of the desk to this side of the desk, but they don't know what the impacts are downstream or upstream. And so I think that as you are looking at outcomes for these training programs, that is something to keep in mind, as well.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Stuart and I will turn it back to you, Paul before I turn it back to the rest of the room. But, I know the Florida Inst. of government and Florida University had a role in creating the curriculum in running the program and so how does that relationship with the University influence the program outcomes and how do you modify or add in conjunction with the University to the trainings that are offered?

>>PAUL LUX: Excellent question and a brief moment of silence for the shooting that FSU just had.

And so I will mention that every class is four hours and they are absolutely adamant about those hours, because it is being underwritten by a professional University. So, when we did convert some of the classes to zoom classes during COVID, as well, just you know I must see you at the window for the entire time, like you cannot close off the camera and wander off somewhere and do a little laundry and put out the cat, whatever. You had to stay right there in front of the camera or you did not get credit for the class. I mean they are very hard-core about that. The 30 core classes do not change themselves or at least the subject matter does not change, but the context does and Maria is one of our instructors, as well. And she will tell you that every time you are scheduled to teach a class, they send you your presentation and they require you to review it and to update it and has anything changed in the law or procedure etc.? That needs to be updated before you teach this class again? And update your slide deck and handouts for the students etc.? All of those things go through and there is a requirement for each class to

have a certain number of face time activities and it is that personal relationship building that I talked about that requires the class to break up into groups and discuss something amongst themselves at least twice during that four hour period of time that you are teaching the class. And when it comes to new coursework, that is where having that master certified professional designation, that is where those expansion classes go. So, they are always looking for new and innovative ideas to put together to make new classes and to flesh out all of those people who had moved onto the master certified professional. And of course the other thing that we do, just like we all did yesterday, those that were here for the ideas lab feedback from the students, right? Very important and I get a lot of feedback from the students I teach like hey, why are you still talking about this piece of old voting agreement? We don't even use that in the state of Florida anymore and why are we even talking about anymore? I want you to understand that this is the reason why we now do this. And so that feedback from the students is vital with Maria with what you just had because you had to update your slide deck as well from the class that you recently taught. And so a lot of those things all tied together and the University helps keep us moving in a very professional direction.

>>SPEAKER: Well, thank you. I do want to take the temperature in the room including the panelists here, as well. What kinds of training? You see in front of you on the handout, we are currently offering in the form of learning lab training and what on that handout do you think is particularly helpful and what can we consider adding to complement what you are all doing and the training programs that exist in your states?

>>SPEAKER: I have one, Karen from North Carolina. I would love to see and it is something that we are pursuing potentially with one of the universities in North Carolina actually UNC Charlotte, right here. The idea of some of the curriculum that is outside of elections, but is a part of professional development in public administration. So, budgeting - strategic planning, things like that. And I think there may be room for that, as well.

>>SPEAKER: And Karen I can shoot you an email with the full 30 course list and like I said I did not -

>>SPEAKER: I am staring at it as we tried -

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Karen. Other suggestions or comments? Secretary Bellows?

>>SPEAKER: I have a question. Maine is one of the states that I have not done learning lab yet and I will try to rectify that. But one of the things that I know in our state that is tricky and I see that a lot of New England states have not joined yet is just a differentiation between the elections and administered elections. And so before we encourage our locals to do these I think my election director would want to do all of them herself and make sure that there was not any contradiction with what we do in Maine or how things are set up in Maine because we are a top-down state and they have less autonomy than you County officials may have. And so I think my question is is there anyway that as you are partnering with the states, do you ever take a training and do any tweaking or customizing like CISA with the emergency training and cybersecurity training that we did, we were able to literally go in and modify a few slides to address the unique structures and the circumstances and laws that we have and so that is probably impossible with video on-demand platforms, but I'm curious about the next generation iteration of it that may allow us to do some modifications so we can say here is the main version of chain of custody just in case some of the chain of custody directions are different than ours.

>>SPEAKER: Is a great question and I can address it in a way that gets back to our in person training options and that is the fact that they can be very - they are very much able to be customized to the needs of specific audiences and states. And based on learning lab content present it in a way that states identify is most useful to their audience and so I would certainly say that there are current options right now that can address that.

>>SPEAKER: And just to add for folks who have not had a chance to look at it you know again we are very cognizant of the fact that we are doing this from the national level and so there are throughout the programming when there are areas and really at the beginning it says you know this is an overview and you know many of these things may be subject to state law or regulation and encourage you to identify that and certainly again aware of that and careful to acknowledge it and most of the programming that you can see so far in that low overhanging fruit has been those 50 state areas or federal law areas and that has really been our focus today primarily.

>>SPEAKER: I am looking for Darren Johnson - how is the Florida system, how is your certification system funded, is it by the state?

>>SPEAKER: It is actually funded by the students and I don't want to put anybody on a spot or anything, but they have the fees that we charge the students have continually been able to stay the same, because most of the teachers are not having to fly people in and put people up in hotels for days at a time and the student fees actually pay for all of that plus a little bit extra and as our association has been banking that plus a little extra part we have gotten quite a sizable bank account, so much so that we had to create a separate bank account within our state association account to manage that money and now that money is being used anytime there is a professional development around a class even in conjunction with the University. Those types of fees are paid by the bank that the program has set aside for that kind of stuff and so it is actually very very beneficial and like I said we have been able to keep the price super super low since the program really started spinning up in 2009.

>>SPEAKER: I do see that we are coming up past time and before we close, are there any other questions for our panelists or about the EAC training options?

>>SPEAKER: Mainly from New Mexico, thank you - I think this has been a great day of conversation and I have learned a lot. I appreciate the learning and so I may pick your brains a little bit later, but my question is for Eddie, can you share how we would sign up for some of the in person trainings, because I think this is a supercool program.

>>ED: Please contact us, there is a form on EAC .gov, but also just feel free to email us and you can email - I don't have a slide that has it handy, but if you want to reach out to the clearinghouse at EAC.gov is a email that can get us to talk about training and again if you would like to utilize the in person speaker form that is available at EAC .gov, that is another way.

>>SPEAKER: Maria Matthews with Florida over here. There were two topics that I would like to suggest perhaps and one is communications and dealing with election matters and the other one would be retention and management and the third one I just thought of another one is just email communications, because and text messaging, because that is so much of how we communicate with each other and staff and the importance of that in context of that later becoming a part of litigation or a story or a public records request.

>>SPEAKER: Receipt on signal - (LAUGHTER).

>>SPEAKER: And Maria you know one of the questions they had asked was what should we add and what should counsel add and I put public records on my list, as well. So, it is nice to see that we are on the same page.

>>SPEAKER: With that I will say thank you to our panelists again and thank you for the valuable information and for participating and I will turn it back to Dag for our closing session here today. Thank you, again.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Ed.

>>DAG ROBINSON: Thank you all, very informative. Commissioner Hovland, any closing remarks for us?

>>BEN HOVLAND: Just on this topic briefly I wanted to add one more little thing which it was good to hear about the Florida and the videos from 2020, but to the degree that as you look at learning lab or think about learning lab I know each state varies and if they have a certification and if it is done by the state or by association and if there are things that we could do to tweak or consider to make this content sort of sufficient for continuing education you know I think that is feedback that we would really like to know and I think the idea of being able to provide this at low cost to localities makes it an added resource and certainly if they are able to count that and defer some costs, I think that is a big deal. And that is something that I think we would be interested in.

As far as the meeting, good news, we have reached the end of the day for most of us. If you are on the executive board I would ask you to remain in the room, we are going to have a brief meeting following this and so do not run out right away and if you are not, I would say that I would like to say thank you to the rest of the members for their participation today and this is the end of our scheduled programming for the day and we have breakfast tomorrow from seven until 9 AM in the same location there on the terrace and we will be back in here tomorrow at 9 AM. Thank you!

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioner. I would like to request and entertain a motion to recess for the day so that we can go off record.

>>SPEAKER: Moved.

>>SPEAKER: Moved and seconded that we recess for the day and all those in favor, please dignify by saying aye.

(MULTIPLE SPEAKERS)

aye. Thank you, recessed until tomorrow morning.

*****DISCLAIMER*****

THE FOLLOWING IS AN UNEDITED DRAFT TRANSLATION. THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE VERBATIM, HAS NOT BEEN PROOFREAD AND MAY CONTAIN ERRORS. PLEASE CHECK WITH THE SPEAKER(S) FOR ANY CLARIFICATION.

THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE COPIED OR DISSEMINATED UNLESS YOU OBTAIN WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM THE OFFICE OR SERVICE DEPARTMENT THAT IS PROVIDING CART CAPTIONING TO YOU.

THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE USED IN A COURT OF LAW. -MB

*****DISCLAIMER*****

>>SPEAKER: Good morning everyone! Welcome back this morning bright-eyed and bushytailed. If we can have everyone out in the lobby make their way back into the room and we will get started.

So, as we reconvene this morning, the executive committee met last night after we recessed and we reelected a new officer for the upcoming year. So, I'm happy to announce our secretary for the incoming year will be Brad King from Indiana. Our vice chair will be Dwight Shellman from Colorado and our chair for the coming year will be Maria Pangelinan from Guam.

Oh, thank you for that. I just want to say for myself that it has been an honor and a privilege to serve as chair this year. It has been a great privilege and experience. And very educating and it has been great to work with all of you.

I do want to say thank you to the standards Board as a whole for arriving here and being here today and the EAC commissioners and the staff for the hard work they do for all of us including not only this meeting but throughout the year. I want to give them all a real round of applause, they do a great job for us.

So, with that we will start our next panel for the morning and we will talk about voter registration signature verification and inclusion of the DMV. We kind of like to include the whole room in this discussion. Commissioner Hovland has a few questions to ask as far as moderating a little bit and I will turn the floor over to you sir.

>>BEN HOVLAND: Thank you, Dag. And while we are in the thank you Mode and recognizing it, I appreciate certainly all of the executive board and Dag, your service this year as chair. Again this is not anybody's day job, it is an extra time commitment, particularly the

executive committee really does take time out of their schedule year-round could help both organize these meetings and to provide valuable feedback. So, thank you for your service and continued service.

>>DAG ROBINSON: Thank you.

>>BEN HOVLAND: And we are going to talk about signatures and I think we have a few folks are going to come up and join us, Paul you may remember from Okaloosa County and I think Dwight Shellman and Dag is also going to join us from the great state of Oregon. And again to think about or to set the scene on this issue and why we wanted to talk about it you know so many of the issues that we work on, it is a 50 state issue or a 45 state issue, those are really the ones that stand out and I think all over the country we continue to hear about challenges with signature matching and that ranges from a number of things whether that is signature pads at motor vehicle offices, whether that is a generation that does not use handwriting or cursive as much as we used to, any number of things. I travel around and I mentioned this at breakfast and I will share maybe I don't know how many funds signature matching stories people have, but as you all may know, the commissioners travel around the country a lot and we see a lot of offices and a lot of the different work that election officials are doing and in King County, Washington, they shared with me that they have a voter they affectionately call the wizard, because the signature is he draws a little picture of a wizard and it looks the same every time more or less and that is his signature. But, the moral of that story is that voters do a lot of things differently and we as election administrators have the challenge of serving those folks and reacting to those differences and doing the best we can.

So, we have got a few different I think scenarios or ways that people interact - training. And so really I just want to check the conversation off to hear a little bit about how things work in your states and how you use signatures and what training is provided and so I guess we can just go down the list, Paul if you want to kick us off.

>>PAUL: I just want to say one thing that the role of Maria Matthews will be played by Paul Lux!

So, how it comes to things in Florida, we have of course vote by mail and very robust initiative petition process and then on top of that we also have a candidate petition process and so there are plenty of opportunities for anybody at all levels of my election organization in every other County to get plenty of practice verifying signatures because there is a lot of it to be done. And in a jurisdiction my size with all 150,000 registered voters, we have a lot of departments of one. And for defense and depth, we have to make sure that everybody has had the required training and everybody is ready to pitch in wherever help is needed, because you know I don't have the staff of Miami-Dade, but thank God I also don't have the problems of Miami-Dade. And so we call ourselves pretty blessed there.

There is some technology, not in a lot of jurisdictions my size and certainly not in smaller jurisdictions, but there are quite a number of offices that are looking at or have already implemented what I would call scan first technology where we are going to scan all of the received ballot envelopes and then just do that signature verification from the scanned image rather than looking at the actual document. It helps them process things a whole lot faster and

they have been able to leverage that same technology like I said for use with either candidate petition and so it reduces overhead and to make the process go faster. And keep it way more organized from their staff.

So, that is kind of the stay on where we are.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you for that, Maria - Paul.

>>DWIGHT SHELLMAN: Hello, Dwight Shellman from Colorado. Like Florida we have plenty of opportunities to capture signatures. Colorado is a true AVR state and we received nightly files from the Department of revenue which is the department in which motor vehicles belong.

And our law required a mail-in ballot and many election voters vote about 97% depending on the election vote by mail rather than in person and in all year November elections, that is higher it is like 98 or 99%. And you know presidential elections it is a little bit lower. 90, 91, 92% and the others vote in person.

Our law required just the signature verification process for balance and a single election judge does what we call first to review and if that judge finds that that signature matches, they are done. That envelope is accepted and it will be counted. If the single tier 1 judge has concerns about the signature and believes it does not matter, that signature is escalated to a bipartisan team and the law is that if both members of that bipartisan team believe the signature does not match, the ballot is rejected pending the voters ability to cure. If the members of the bipartisan team disagree or both agree that it matches that it is accepted and the ballot will be counted.

We do require and we have done a couple things on this. We do require all signature verification judges to go through a training offered by the Secretary of State. And the State elections division has prepared - it is called the signature verification guide and I think the important thing from my standpoint is both of those resources really stress - just take a breath, judges - no two signatures of any individual ever match exactly. So, do not get hung up on the match, look for characteristics of the signature. The slant, the loop, all of the other elements that comprise a signature.

And I think that training is effective, but you always end up with election judges who you know no matter how much training they take, they feel like they cannot accept it unless it is an exact match and so to address the problem we require every County Clerk to periodically audit the signature verification judges work and just look for kind of outline rejection numbers and if they are seeing a judge who is being like just really too strenuous, they can reassign them and they can ask them to take the training again, what have you.

We also have statewide initiative petitions and candidate petitions and our log currently requires if the Secretary of State is going to certify that ballot measure or candidate for the ballot, then we are required to do signature verification on the petition. And I mentioned that only because the law is different for candidates on county office. Those petitions are processed by the individual counties and the law does not permit them to verify signatures. They are required to

verify each petition entry. The name of the motor, the address of the voter, etc. If those match the voter registration record, then they match the signature.

The final thing that I would like to mention is that we mentioned on a statewide basis ballot track and text secure in the 2020 general election and when we first rolled out those systems, we made a conscious decision not to use ballot tracks to notify voters that their signature had been rejected if they were able to cure and that was simply because we got it up and running rather late and as any of you have ever been involved with this kind of work, some people get really really mad when they get correspondence from the clerk saying that they need to cure their ballot. And we just felt with everything going on in 2020 that we did not want to drive a whole bunch of angry people to every clerk's office. And so we made the conscious decision not to use those systems for rejected cured signatures adjusted so we can get our fee under ourselves.

In 2022, we changed that, we started using ballot tracks to notify voters that their ballots were accepted or rejected and in connection with that we altered both the mandatory correspondence that come out of the voter registration base and what we used in ballot track to say your ballot has been rejected and we have an opportunity to cure and you can do it right now using a mobile device with text to cure. In that persuaded a lot of the upset that we would otherwise see and I think it works pretty well and so that was a big experiment that we undertook and thus far it has been successful. And generally our counties do just an amazing job of making sure ballots are properly accepted or rejected. So, that is it.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Dwight. Dag?

>>DAG ROBINSON: Thank you. Oregon I could basically say ditto from Colorado. Their system was basically designed from Oregon's assistant because we did it first. So, with only a couple of changes and a couple differences, our team is the only official that is receiving the ballot and does the initial verification of the signature. If they find that it is rejected then it moves forward to a supervisor or elections official in that county. It is not done by a bipartisan group in Oregon. It just moves to the next level if it is found to be rejected and then the supervisor makes that decision. If it is found to be rejected then we have the same cure process and we have up to 20 days to cure either a signature no match or a rejected signature that does match and we are 100% vote by mail, we do not have voting centers where early voting is all done with the same system and we can issue a ballot from the office and it would be the same one that they would have gotten by mail. And so a reissue and the same thing if they were to use it, we can reissue with the same ballot and a different envelope of course that would cancel the other envelope. Aside from that, the processes are very very similar. We do a training again sponsored by the elections division and that is the goal to prove exactly what Dwight said. It is not a perfect match of the signature, it is the characteristics of that signature. The darkness - after doing it for so long, you can really tell there are characteristics that are very clear that is the same signature. So, other than that it is really the same process.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you for that, I have a couple more questions and before I get to those I will T folks up and I know it is early and people have not had as much coffee as they would like to I know that I'm about 7 cups shy of my normal morning and as stated earlier this is an issue that we hear about a lot and so part of like what we would like to invite in the conversation today

is you know other people have done or thought about I was looking for Michael from Minnesota, he moved on me, Minnesota does not use signature matching or the use it as a last resort. The use unique identifiers first and if those are not available then they go to signature and if there is nothing else we learn this morning at breakfast from Nancy from Georgia that Georgia has recently changed their law and they use a unique identifier and PII verification and they look beyond the signature as the element or proving identity in that regard. I think that is an interesting piece of the conversation. And then I think from the EAC standpoint, you know part of what we are trying to think about is is there a role for us to play that we can be supportive through election officials and to me that ranges from maybe it is a learning lab and high-level training on some techniques to look at and I think we can look around at best practices in different ways that states are engaging here. We added some information on the eaves to get a better understanding around cure and we can understand that further and a good conversation I had yesterday and am thinking about is that it can be template signage that goes at motor vehicle offices that tells people hey, this signature is going to be used down the road, please sign appropriately. And again I'm giving folks a little bit of extra time to get there thinking hat on to Give People a Little Bit More Time for Coffee and so let's hear from Tony!

>>SPEAKER: For people interpreting - so, a few questions - starting with the stage and wherever the gentleman from Minnesota is an for your messages that you send out either for ballot tracks or text-to-cure, putting you on the spot if you remember, do you know what language you use when the ballot has now been signature verified and it has been sent into be tabulated but they have not run it through the machine yet and that for us is the last message. So, we have been sending the message that your signature has been verified and your ballot has been sent into be tabulated and we get lots of angry feedback that well, I was expecting one more to tell me that it was tabulated and you know now it is anonymous and so we expect that it had, but - and if so how do you address that crossover piece and do you have that issue?

>>SPEAKER: We had experienced that particularly in 2020 when we implemented the system statewide and I believe the messaging at the time was we split out acceptance and counted. And that generated a lot of confusion that frankly I did not anticipate and so we changed if the envelope has been accepted we have two messages, just because counties cannot start counting ballots until 15 days prior. So, the two messages are before that 15 day time, we say that your ballot has been accepted and will be counted as soon counties are permitted to start counting ballots or something much more elegant than that, but that was basically the just and when we enter into the 15 days where counties are actually tabulating, the message changes. Your ballot has been accepted and counted.

>>SPEAKER: So, the people before the 15 days, do they get a second text message that says your ballot was counted?

>>SPEAKER: That is a really good question, Tanya - I don't think so, because we don't really have any other data points to be able to trigger -

>>SPEAKER: And even though you have not seen the ballot go to the tabulator you say it is accepted and counted.

>>SPEAKER: Yes. And that actually raises another issue that I can just share. Not every rejected ballot is curable under Colorado law. For example, voters who live in the same household put both of their ballots in a single envelope and maybe one of them signs, but never two of them. That ballot is rejected and they are not permitted to cure and the only thing they

can do is vote provisionally which I think would also be rejected. The other issue is empty envelopes. People drop the return envelopes with nothing inside. And that is not curable. And these are and there may be a few of these in each election and these are not widespread problems, but the other final issue is that somebody drops their ballot in a dropbox, but not in an envelope. And we have no idea who's ballot that is. And we cannot accept or reject it, because we literally do not know which Rotary belongs to. So, these are exceptions on the margins. And now I forgot where I was going with this -

>>SPEAKER: If you are getting a message that your signature was accepted and your ballot was counted and now we have an empty envelope, that may not be the case -

>>SPEAKER: Yes, so the empty envelope situation, they are just not going to get a message from ballot tracks, they will get correspondence. And what we learned is even though the signature has been accepted, because the envelope might be empty and you know that is somewhat easier to detect, but there also might be two ballots in the envelope or we could be in a primary election and an unaffiliated voter returns both a Republican and a Democratic ballot and those kinds of things. And our first run-up with this is we encountered several situations where the voter had received a message or correspondence indicating their ballot had been accepted and then after the deconstruction process the other problem was discovered. So, we for several years have just reminded counties, do not put a ballot in accepted status until you are absolutely sure that it can be accepted without those other weird things that sometimes happen. And you know it will be counted. They adopted and it is not the problem that it initially created.

>>SPEAKER: And I add onto that Dwight because we are starting to encounter the same problem and so although I do not use ballot tracks and I know there are jurisdictions in Florida that do and I unfortunately don't know what their messaging is, but I do know that all of us have our maze systems built into the website also helps people track the status of the ballot and that it has been sent and received and counted and only last session our legislature changed the law and now prohibits us from counting any ballots in an envelope where two or more ballots are received. And so now because once it has gone onto the canvassing Board you know most of the time until we open the ballot if there is two inside and you know that May's message has already been put up there that your ballot has been counted and then after the election they're going to get a letter from us saying that your letter did not get counted. And so we have had to start in this last round of special elections that we just went through, we actually proactively reached out to the voter who had put two ballots in an envelope and said your ballot is not yet going to get counted and so please go to the polling place and tell them that you need to vote a provisional ballot and then the canvassing Board later adjudicated because we know their male ballot did not get counted even though receiving a ballot from a voter is considered cast, the canvassing Board voted to accept the ballot. And so we are going to have to rethink our process on that and at what stage we say your ballot has been counted, we used to wait and then in 2020 because of the heavy volume of mail, people were freaking out and it says you got my ballot a week ago and why hasn't it been counted yet? And because half the offices out with COVID and nobody is doing anything and so it was just a lag and now we waited until vote history and that is not really fast enough for the modern voter and that makes me glad I'm not using ballot tracks just yet, but that is going to be a bigger headache because having elections right next to each other January, March 11, municipal and April/primary, we had people who

were returning municipal ballots and sorry, the law says if there is two ballots in the envelope, I cannot count it. And it does not give us any leeway for that. And so that is a conundrum that we are going to have to be fleshing out.

>>SPEAKER: Not every county uses ballot tracks or a system like that. Some do and I am one that does not use that. It is paid for by the counties on that level. And so when we report we just don't offer that service unfortunately. But, we do track the ballot is posted on the secretary's website in the my ballot portion of the website that tracks and we simplify that messaging until we have received it or it is accepted meaning that we have accepted the signature on the ballot and when it goes beyond that we will deal with that administratively. And good or bad that is what we have had to work with up to this point. And so with us all not using ballot tracks, not every voter in Oregon gets the same opportunity and messaging unfortunately. But, we leave it's amplified at the state website level so we can keep it to that and help eliminate some of the drama that can come with that if we don't have perfect messaging.

>>SPEAKER: I saw a hand in the back.

>>SPEAKER: This is (NAME) from New Hampshire and so for the panel or anybody else in here, state of New Hampshire you know this happened to be when I was a local, had a lawsuit outdated we can no longer do signature comparison. That our election officials are not signature - they don't have the qualifications to be a signature advisor and to be able to say yes, the signatures match, is there anything like that? I think out maybe 2016 or 17 and so it is interesting to hear that the states appear on the panel and they are the ones that are also training some of those judges or the supervisors to do that, because I think the court also ruled that Secretary of State office did not have people that were experts in order to do signature comparison and so I'm interested to hear if anybody else had any of those types of issues or if those issues have been wrought to them?

>>SPEAKER: I will say for the Florida training, the training is artfully done by a signature expert. What I find probably a little bit more interesting is that that lawsuit that you got suffered has not spread faster and more jurisdictions since there is already a legal precedent to hang your hat on and so although we go through the signature training, in Florida law we have one it is a petition, the law just says that we check that it is valid and verified and it is not actually say in our law that we are supposed to check the signature, but we believe that is what valid and verified means and when we look at vote by mail ballots they have beyond a reasonable doubt or the signature. Not the true legal definition of beyond reasonable doubt that you get in a court of law, but it is a slightly watered-down version of that and still has a similar meaning.

And so all we -- although we go through that training, there are certainly people you know well, that is my signature and the most interesting thing about the training is that the expert tells the upfront that in order to have a good base for handwriting analysis and for signature comparison, you should have 15 or more samples and how many of us have 15 or more registration forms from every voter to use as a sample for what the signature is supposed to look like and the answer is probably not very many. Or maybe three with a couple of voters. And it makes it much more challenging and because of those issues I am really surprised at the validity of the signature verification has not spread faster.

>>SPEAKER: To that point, Paul, I would like to have Dwight tell us about score and actually Colorado I'm not sure how many other states do, but Colorado certainly keeps signatures from sort of every interaction and I'm not going to embarrass myself with details -

>>DWIGHT SHELLMAN: The requirement is basically every form that a voter has signed whether that is voter initiation form or a mail ballot or in person voting signature card, all of those get scanned into each voters record. And so we have an extensive history of signatures over time for voters that have been registered a long time. And the E poll book that we use is actually just a web application that exchanges data real-time with decentralized voter registration database. And we need to do that, because in addition to AVR, we are also same-day registration and we use those centers and as soon as somebody cast a ballot, everybody else in the state needs to know that.

And so I think our system has worked well and the problematic cases are typically younger voters for whom you know we don't have a history of signatures and they tend not to really use the same signature or transaction after transaction. In addition to text-to-cure we also have a slightly different system called text to sign where the counties periodically send correspondence to registered voters for whom they know they do not have a signature image on file. And it text to sign works very much the same way as text to cure. It is just that they consigned a voter affirmation using their mobile device and submit it and so that signature will then be added to their voter record in the registration database.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you for that.

>>SPEAKER: Tim from North Carolina, I have two questions. The first one being if you could describe the acceptance threshold or standards that you have in your jurisdiction for voters with medical conditions or with a disability and then the second question - and I will start with that question first.

>>SPEAKER: I had a canvassing judge one time that was always looking at invalid signature and how old is the person and if they were older than the judge, then they were willing to give them to say are they older than the judge or not older than the judge and that was their question for us. And certainly if they are coded, that gives them a lot more leeway when it comes to signatures because a lot of our voters who need assistance, some of them are not able to actually make any type of signature and so whatever mark they are able to make is considered valid and particularly at in person voting where you have somebody who is with them to assist them. But, when it comes to the vote by mail ballots that is taken into consideration and so although I said we look at the one or two signatures that I had, Florida does allow us to go back to our E poll book of signatures which are captured and so we can look at those as a secondary and when we look at the primary consideration we are only allowed to use voter education forms and I have all the documents, but I am not allowed to use them. And we look at, has there signature degraded over time and all of those things factor in and at the end of the day it becomes a vote of the canvassing Board, do we or do we not count it and for the most part those ballots are accepted. So, in Colorado the mail ballot envelope sort of anticipates that someone may not be able to sign and there is a legend printed on the envelope that says if you are unable to sign, you may make a mark on the voter signature line and have another person witness it by signing on the witness line.

Which I think ameliorates a lot of those issues and the problem is that people start providing a full signature on the voter signature line and then somebody else's signature on the witness line as if that bombproof their mail ballot and that is not the case. And it does not matter if somebody witness to, they are going to get a rejection.

>>SPEAKER: Oregon law is a little bit different, we require a signature stamp attestation form and that allows the voter to leave whatever their mark is going to be from whatever they are going to use and they can provide that to us if for some reason they do not have one of those on file they can notify us that they need assistance or cannot make a mark. We are required to send out a bipartisan voter assistance team that can go to them and help them with whatever their need is. And if they need help signing a form or just a witness or whatever they need to do with that bipartisan team within the local election officials sends them out to help the voter. And in almost all of the cases I am not aware of any issues with that and it seems to work well for us.

>>SPEAKER: And a line of privilege, I will let you ask a second!

>>SPEAKER: Thank you! So, for voters who have concerns about sensitivity and confidentiality about their signatures, what would you say to them about the measures or protocols you have a place to secure the signature files?

>>SPEAKER: The signature files or the signatures themselves? We did get a lot of pushback particularly in 2024 people who had never voted by mail before that in Florida your signature goes on the outside of the envelope and then into the postal stream and a lot of people freak out about that and I am sorry, but my County is very proud to say that we have the lowest mail-in rate in Florida but that also means we have less funding than everybody else. And there are plenty of counties who do an extra envelope or a tear off flap or one of those with extensive envelope designs to protect the signature in my County if you don't want to put your signature on the envelope and stick it in the mail, we have secured ballot intake stations not to be confused with ballot drop boxes and you can drop a ballot into -

>>SPEAKER: That was the origin of the ballot drop box!

>>SPEAKER: And you can bring it to one of those locations and the intake station you can drop it in their or you can vote in person early or on election day.

>>DWIGHT SHELLMAN: In Colorado we have been doing this for so long rather than all mail-in ballots we had voters in most counties that had been voting by mail for 20 years - more than that. Yes. So, in any event, it does not create a lot of problems. One of the things I really enjoy about working in Colorado is our counties tend to be the laboratories for innovation. That is how dropbox started in our state. It is how text-to-cure and text-to-sign and ballot tracks and those other systems - and we, the Secretary of State's office, once those other alternate systems get to scale, we try to make it available to all counties at our expense so they can use their money for other innovations.

But, in Colorado the vast majority of mail-in voters, they return those to drop boxes and that helps with the messaging regarding the security of their signature on the outside of the envelope. Because, it is not going through the mail stream, it will be picked up by bipartisan teams of judges and these people have no reason to agree with one another on anything except process and they are returned securely to the central count facility of each county. And as a

result the signature on the outside of the envelope is just not exposed to a whole bunch of people which may be the case otherwise.

>>SPEAKER: Just to clarify my question and I believe one of you mentioned that you scanned the signatures on the back of the envelopes.

>>SPEAKER: In Florida despite our incredibly broad public records laws for everything under the sun, one thing that is not allowed to be disclosed is your signature and so the signatures are a separate thing that is never - and I mean you would quite literally have to get into the servers and into the database tables to get your hands on a signature in Florida. It is not something that was ever released as a public records request, it has to be redacted if somebody asked for copies of things and even signatures on vote by mail envelopes, I am not a county that scans them, but like I said there are plenty who do and those signatures are not public record.

>>DWIGHT SHELLMAN: Same is true in Colorado, that is personal identifying information and exempt from public record. Interestingly, that is not true for petitions. There is a provision of our law that says petitions are public records -

>>SPEAKER: Your verifying against the same signature -

>>SPEAKER: Maybe, maybe not. I'm not sure against the rationale, but in any event for the most part signatures are exempt from public records disclosure.

>>SPEAKER: Exactly the same in Oregon. They are confidential.

>>SPEAKER: Did they take it from Oregon?

>>SPEAKER: Probably. You know we have been doing this you know in 1984 is when we began doing vote by mail and so special elections and whatnot and in certain counties they were doing vote by mail beginning then and so they started developing these plans and programs and it has become tried-and-true for us and of course we have done the same as Colorado with the counties thinking well, what if we try this and what if we improved by these things and in Washington we have done exactly that, we have done all of the things that try to improve the processes and every time we think okay, we have fixed this problem, suddenly we find out how did we miss that, that happens all the time, too!

>>SPEAKER: There has been some litigation some successful and some not an Paul, some of those cases were dismissed, right? I think they found the value of signature comparison. But you know we occasionally hear complaints from counties that it is very difficult to do the signature comparison process and the curing process and typically with deficiencies as we talk about the DMV and capturing good signatures. But you know I mentioned unique identifiers and that is a small trend. What other technologies have you thought about in the future if signature comparison started to go away as an option or what would you think - what other technologies have you thought about? Or if there is any?

>>PAUL LUX: To me that is a really tough nut to crack because although your drivers license or partial social is a protected part of your voter record in Florida, along with your signature, I mean I know my spouse 's drivers license number and all I would need to do is just to drop that number down and mail in her ballot. Nothing without that if there is not a signature to be verified. And so as much as that - our biggest challenge with signatures from DMV has been despite and we had to push for this in the law, we had to push to require DMV to provide a 300 dpi signature and DMV somehow is just completely ignore that law and still does not provide us the 300 dpi signature and if I were ignoring laws, I think out find myself on the on the plumbing line and so I'm not sure what is going on there. But, we are continuing to seek improvement on

the signatures that we get. I like what you mentioned earlier Commissioner Hovland about the signature signage at the DMV clerk's desk to say please do not just give us the Walmart slop that you tried to get out of here because what we actually needed is your signature because we are really going to use this for something important. And so I like that idea. But, I do not know what other technology short of I don't know we could of fingerprint identification or biometrics which will make mail-in ballots a lot more expensive.

>>SPEAKER: I agree with Paul. I mean the other I guess obvious alternatives may be biometrics. First of all, believe me I do not make these decisions in Colorado, they are for other people and that gives me a lot of laws. Just because I think most voters well - I think a lot of people would be very uncomfortable if there County Clerk had like extensive biometric data on them. I could be wrong.

The other thing I've heard from my friends who are computer scientist is some type of cryptographic solution for unique identifiers and my conversations on those issues are fairly brief, because if you are going to generate like a 16 character alphanumeric string, that is just not going to work. Because, most voters will not be able to provide that information reliably and accurately on the back of their ballot for example.

So, I don't know what can ultimately replace signature verification. Nancy told us you know that Georgia has stopped and they are doing another method. That is a little interesting and Minnesota, too. But, our law has not changed on this for 30 years, probably.

>>SPEAKER: My concern and I guess that would just have to be a unique identifier, but I see bipartisan opposition for the signature comparison at times and I see litigation that could be successful at some point. And there has to be alternatives. And so that is my concern.

>>SPEAKER: And another one I was thinking of is that I suppose much like your ATM card where you are allowed to self select a pin, I mean if you could - build in the system they may be text-to-sign or text-to-cure where you could submit a pin that would become a part of your permanent voter record and in addition to the unique identifier like your drivers license number and your Social Security number that you would also then have to provide that pin and then to do that we would have to have the pin on file and I don't want to be the got answering the phone in Miami trying to get people pin numbers. That would be hard enough to do in my County with 150,000 voters. So, every one of those solutions will come with its own set of challenges, certainly.

>>SPEAKER: I would like to - this is a pretty far ranging one and I would like to open it up also to folks and members out there and I see Secretary Bellows has a comment.

>>SPEAKER: I think this is where the EAC can be helpful, because so in Maine, again, we are not affirmatively required to match every single signature everything on time, it is a safeguard if there are questions raised by other factors. But, you know I love my nieces and nephew, but they were not taught cursive and my nephews signature looks different every single time and it is - and I really do think that this is an area where we need to do some research and I'm curious about what the banking and financial and again to Paul 's point maybe it is pin based, although we have enough time with local clerks and their passwords for this CVR. And there are other industries where identity really matters and I'm sure that they are doing some probably forward thinking work on this and I do think that it is going to be an

emerging issue as you know and also running the DMV, but we are just seeing some real changes where people are not signing and they are printing and then you get into the whole - well, that is her signature if that is what they do now. But, that is also more challenging to differentiate than the old-fashioned.

>>SPEAKER: And to the pin thing, most of us are old enough term ever that when you sign up for the bank and you get the ATM card and then you get the pin number in the mail later and if it became where we are going to mail in the pin number, then the specter would immediately be raised well, now it has been announced that the election people are sending up pins to vote by mail and there will be a bunch of people stealing mail to get pin numbers. And it will definitely have to be more of an in person telephonic screening something or other to go along with all of that.

>>SPEAKER: One, two, three, four?

>>SPEAKER: Just like my luggage!

>>DWIGHT SHELLMAN: The one thing we did in Colorado is we hired Center for Civic designed to help us work with the Department of revenue on their signature capture devices and at least from a signature verification state that is just a critical piece of infrastructure. And so there is messaging on those now that says something like please sign - please provide a signature as you would on any legal document that this signature will be used to verify your ballot in future elections or something like that. And there is also signage. It is not a perfect solution, because you really need the motor vehicle attendant to like almost audibly remind them and for some reason that seems to be a huge lift at the Department of revenue, generally.

>>SPEAKER: If only you had motor vehicle under your purview! (LAUGHTER).

>>SPEAKER: If only!

>>DWIGHT SHELLMAN: So I have heard!

>>SPEAKER: Tonya?

>>TONYA: Over the years even when we were discussing voter ID and P 200 for the state of Arizona, we were causally able to say signature verification is the one thing that you cannot fake. And over the years we have found that when somebody is really trying to copy somebody else's signature, inevitably it is mom for a college student that has gone away or a wife or husband that is on a business trip you know it is a family member. And so I'm trying to wrap my head around and I would love it if somebody in here is doing the other personal identifiers or Texas or Georgia could help me understand how do you do this process in a way that it is not the husband or the mom or the ex-spouse that remembers all of the PII for the other person. That is the stumbling block that I'm trying to get over the hurdle as this legislation is being introduced in my state. And so if somebody has insights I would really love it.

>>SPEAKER: Tom, would you like to share about your chuckle? Sorry - Nancy, we would love to hear about Georgia and I would preface this by saying Nancy is not a part of the Georgia state legislature, feel like you is an administrator and implemented this.

>>NANCY: I signed my husband's signature just as well as he does and so using the philosophy of exes signing information you know in Georgia we do the drivers license number and 98% of our registered voters have a divers license or an ID card issued by the Department of driver services and it has been wonderful in Georgia, because it has taken away this subjective comparison of signature and now we look at just objective numbers. People

sometimes though invert numbers and of course we have to go through the QR process, but we would never want to go back to the signature verification.

>>SPEAKER: So it is just the drivers license number?

>>NANCY: Drivers license and date of birth and there has to be a mark on the signature line but we do not verify the signature.

>>SPEAKER: Andrew?

>>SPEAKER: Andrew, Nebraska we recently switched for both Glendale counties which we have 11 of them to do this combination where we require the drivers license or some other thing that we can verify and then we also use the signature, too. And personally I like that hybrid model because you get that added security of the drivers license and it helps alleviate some of the problems and you can also use how they write their drivers license number on their if you are looking at comparing from their other forms if it is something where you're really concerned, but we have still found husband signing for wives in the ballots are returned at the same time and low and behold it was all written in the same handwriting and it looks really close to the husband signature, but like you can tell that it was the same person. And I still like having that signature element, because you have Carol return it ballot for Mark and she signs Carol on the line and says yes, that is marked signature. I don't know if I like that.

>>SPEAKER: And we have this interesting thing to come Andrew where of course a lot of military spouses, their spouses deployed somewhere and so the wife signs of the ballot and then of course we are required to follow up to say your ballot is not counted because the signature was not cured and so it was rejected and then we go back and look and say you know what, we rejected this person signature in the last election and look, we rejected and the one before that and it is the same wife and of course the wife gets the letter and the husband is not home and she froze in the trashcan and nobody ever sees the letter that is addressed to the voter to say that your ballot did not get counted.

>>SPEAKER: When organ holds the attestation - It is pretty serious and you are swearing that you are not committing a felony by signing this envelope. And you are the person that sent Sue and it is your address and you are you and if you are sounding somewhat else's name in that envelope, you are committing a felony.

And in Oregon we follow-up with that and actually prosecute it and we take it very seriously and I think the voters do, as well.

>>SPEAKER: Laura Rogers from Texas. And we just recently implemented on our ballots by mail you have to return either the last four of your social or your driver's license number and it has to match what is on your application. The problem that we have run into is that those numbers are missing and so that is a rejection on those ballots or they have put their drivers license number on their application and their Social Security number on their ballot and then they don't have that match. So, there are some complications to having those and it is something that my signature verification committee brings those back to me and I am able to log into teams and verify those numbers, but that is a problem that we have encountered in Texas.

>>SPEAKER: What kind of percentage are you seeing being rejected because they omit that number?

>>SPEAKER: Very little. Because, we have implemented it, I think it has been two cycles that we have had that hearing and so we see it getting better and better each time because of

the education that we have sent out. So, it is getting better and it is very minimal, but that is still a problem with rejecting those ballots not having those numbers. And it is usually the same voters every single time that you have to remind them every time.

>>SPEAKER: I just wanted to follow up on what Dag said. County clerks in Colorado are required to refer certain items after each election to their district attorneys or investigation and possible prosecution and one of those items is somebody's ballot was rejected and they did not cure.

So, it is just another way that we take the affirmation seriously. The other thing I will say is that I am now at the Secretary of State's office and I used to work in the county and I realize that we are talking about a lot of nuances and things and the unanticipated that you have to figure out. But, for the most part at least in my experience when I was actually doing signature verification, it is like 98% of the signatures that you are verifying, there is just no question. They are either a match or they are not. And so yes, there are exceptions on the margins, but at least in my view I do not think that those exceptions really impact the vast vast majority of voters. Most voters almost all voters, just want to vote once. At least in my experience.

>>SPEAKER: And I actually used that as a illustrative point when I was testifying in front of one of the legislative communities about the signature verification process has had low, most of the time, 99% of the time it is the signature that matches the voter signature and everybody's happy and when we see those nonmatching signatures it is like the signature of record look like a perfect penmanship second-grader signed it and then we get the Walmart squiggle on the ballot or your official signature of record is the one on record and then I get one that is then clearly legible and it is almost always a night and day. It is never down into the weeds of you know it was the letterspacing and the shape of this letter different you know it is not a forgery or a trace - it is either night and day. Most of the time.

>>SPEAKER: I also wanted to mention something. How about ESTEP, because the way that you hold the stylus I mean a lot of them you're like okay, I'm going to give my signature and you don't have a place to rest your Palm or whatever. I mean that is just bad design. So, just an idea.

>>SPEAKER: I agree with Dwight. Some of the poorest signatures we have in our system are legacy DMV system signatures. They are literally just a weird Mark on a digital pad that was almost analog. And so given the opportunity we can see those and say we have to have a new signature and we contact the voter and we get a nice decent plane signature from them that we can then use. And we keep that one on record as well as one of the exemplars and so it is still there and still an ugly signature, but some of the technology that was used early on was terrible and some of it still is terrible. And so that would be incredibly helpful.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you. Anybody else do something in their state that we have not talked about? There have been a few interesting new ones. Going once - one other thing and this has come up a few times and I just want to throw it out there, obviously I think that point on the vast majority of people being able to utilize this in different contexts is voter verification and signatures on the front end and whether that is about what is involved and if they get notified about receipt and any voter education pieces are on this topic or communicating with voters around their signatures that have been particularly effective?

>>SPEAKER: One of the most startling things in 2020 with the vote by mail with a number of people who absolutely had no idea that we actually did compare the signatures. I was like what? Why did you think we would not do that? That is like the only secure part of voting by mail is being able to verify that signature. And quite a number of them in the state said they did not even do it on initial petitions, they just check off that they got it and if they had a signature it is good. And I really do think that some of the media reporting and certainly multimedia or multimedia markets in my case we share the media market with Alabama and when it is election day in Alabama I get a bunch of phone calls why isn't my polling place open, I saw on TV it is election day and yes - over the border there.

But, the ability to reach out to the voter and so part of what Florida law requires we include in our sample ballots that we mailed to voters is notification that if you think your signature needs to be updated please update your signature and that is always a part of our voter outreach. We have built that into the voter information card that we send voters to and if your signature is changed and if you have gotten married or change your name or whatever, please update your signature and here's how you go about doing that. Now that we use an online voter registration system of course now we are just getting whatever the last signature was from the DMV and so that does not necessarily always help when it comes to that. But, it is helpful for people to be able to make some of those changes and not submit a new signature. Probably the best tool we have is like I said we are allowed to capture E Paul book signatures and use those for other purposes. And most of those best signatures are now coming from the captured E Paul book signature.

I have to say one of the most rewarding things about this when we send out correspondence for a rejected signature is when that voter comes racing into the office, they are flat pissed like what do you mean my signature did not match and we bring them behind and we show them and your whole story would have been different if you just that way, I did not sign a ballot and we actually check and verify and make sure it is you and it is so typical like I had no idea that you check every signature! You talk about a educational component and it is every time and usually the situation is that. There signature on exemplar is just a scribble like at Walmart and they signed their full name, middle initial and we say well, sign like we - sign like you are going to sign a timecard like how do you sign every day most things which is how we would like you to sign so we can get a good signature.

And then they understand like it does not have to be exactly with my middle name - no, it is your signature, your mark, your picture of yourself. But, really rewarding to get those folks coming in.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you for that and go ahead Stuart.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioner. So, I believe in Colorado you have automatic signature verification and I think Oregon had considered some legislation in this area and I had not heard the panel talk at all about that and just interested to know if there is any observations or reason that has not been discussed.

>>SPEAKER: Colorado has a statute that permits County Clerk to use signature verification devices and automatic signature verification. Many of the larger counties do and the two most widely used systems in Colorado are runback A (SP?) system and blue crest is the other

system and it used to be (NAME) and everybody else. And the election rules require counties using those systems to audit then continually throughout and I am sorry I do not remember the exact number, but if they get from their automated signature verification where it is giving them a false positive, they have to stop using that and move to human beings to do that work.

So, that is a whole different area of complexity and the large counties with the volumes that they are dealing with they just need to use ballot receiving systems that are automated and periodically counties have decided not to use the ASR feature and they were just not comfortable with the kind of matches or mismatches that the system was generating and so that is largely in their discretion and I think the statute was passed to explicitly have County Clerk to use those systems and maybe also to tell the Secretary of State and this is long ago, do not mess with this. You do not have any authority over that kind of. And so we do not certify those systems.

And we do not personally ourselves use those systems. And so in any event yes, they are being used and there is a number of different vendors, but honestly Stuart, I have not seen like just wildly different acceptance or rejection rates from them and the counties are required to continually audit them and it is pretty rigorous and I think they do a good job.

>>SPEAKER: And for Florida and Maria, please correct me if I'm wrong since this is your panel (CHUCKLE) so, Miami used to use automatic signature verification and there was a lot of argument that they were trying to build standards into the law about what percentage threshold of if it is a 80% match, 90% match, 99% match, I don't know how it all works. I know that when we started going to all people have to go through signature verification training or verifying signatures I think did they disallow that now? Is that something that we -

>>SPEAKER: No, Paul, they did not. Or should I call you Maria? By the way, next time, put a little bit more wrist -

>>SPEAKER: I am really confused!

>>SPEAKER: This panel is all out of time!

>>SPEAKER: I did not bring the right shade of lipstick, Maria!

>>SPEAKER: So, we adopted a rule to implement the law and with the signature training we also put a component and therefore automated you know signature verification usage like supplement. But, ultimately the canvassing Board still has to be the final arbiter.

>>SPEAKER: The largest county in Oregon uses it and they calibrated before every election and they are only accepting the top 11% and it is like the absolute and when they audit that, they audit literally I think 99% of the ones that they are using because they are actually testing this in the top 11% it is spot on every time and it has to be really high, the top 11% and the others all go through the normal process. And so I think they have been happy with it and it took the process a little bit and the auditing is incredibly important.

>>SPEAKER: The short answer Stuart is because we do not to talk about it!

>>SPEAKER: That did bring us to the end of this panel and so a big hand for the panelists!

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, I think this was a really useful conversation and it does bring us to the morning break, the! That you have all been waiting for and so please be back at 10:30 AM where we will talk about the election administration and voting survey which I know that you are all passionate about, thank you.

(BREAK)

>>SPEAKER: Hello, there we are. I know it is sad to end the break and I saw some tasty treats out there, but let's grab our plates and start getting ready to talk about data and research. Hey, I like the enthusiasm, thank you, Susan!

>>SPEAKER: All right, as you are coming back and finding your seats, for those of you I have not had the pleasure of meeting, my name is Kammi Foote and one of the programs I oversee is the election administration and voting survey along with our research director who is not in the room with us today. And as you can see I am join here on stage with Commissioner Hovland and we are going to talk a little bit about the current status of the eaves and some of the improvement we have been working on over the last few months and years and then we are going to talk about some potential updates to the survey.

So, I wanted to just turn off and say I think I speak on behalf of the entire Cleary we echo Brianna 's comments that she led within her opening statements in saying thank you very much for completing the EAVS survey, we have 100% compliance and so all of you spent time to fill out and complete the survey and I think that deserves a round of applause.

I personally know the amount of work that goes into completing the EAVS prior to coming to EAC and I did it through 2006 through the 2020 election cycle and so when we say thank you, we really mean it and we understand that it is a heavy lift.

>>BEN HOVLAND: For those of you who are newer, you may not have heard me make the joke that I used to have hair and that is not true, but it just tells you that we have come a long way!

>>KAMMI FOOTE: We have talked a lot about the NVRA through this conference and as most of you are aware or maybe those of you who are not, EAVS has the roots in the NVRA with the requirements about voting registration and that is the impetus when the EAVS was established under HAVA, our mandate was expanded beyond voter registration. And in HAVA it says the purpose of EAVS is to collect data on election cactuses on states and jurisdictions, published findings and provide Congress with the functioning of federal elections and similar as you are all bearing the conduct of the election we are preparing to shield the EAVS to collect the data right after the election and so we start the process long before the survey itself is fielded.

This year we sent the data survey out to our points of contact on November 12. We do realize that many of you are still counting and certifying the vote at that time or you had just completed and we had sent it to you with giving you as much time as possible to look at the data, look at the questions and be able to start gathering information on how to - finish the survey.

Currently we are in the process of finalizing the data and as mentioned earlier this data will go to Congress on June 30 and our intention is to share that widely with you all as well as points of contact as soon as the report is available. The primary purposes of EAVS is to provide that comprehensive snapshot after each election and so it really does tell the story about the 2024 election. And when it is sent to Congress and others in part it is to help inform policy decisions and one of its ultimate goals is to help identify areas of improvement.

So, we had a working group in January of last year and one of the things we ask of them is how they used EAVS in the past and it was helpful when comparing data and it was also contributed to future planning efforts also with new policies that it offered insights into voting technologies and other jurisdictions across country and helps provide basis for election budget decisions and we even learned earlier at the LLC that one of the states used EAVS data to get election funding from their state office. They told us the EAVS data specifically provided context about how the responsibilities have changed and increased over time and that was able to be used as an argument that was persuasive with their legislature to get dedicated election funding.

We have also heard and we know that it is not easy to collect and report the data. So, the EAC has put a significant effort into trying to make it as easy as possible over the last several cycles and I am not going to go through all of the bullet points here, but one of the things that I wanted to highlight is that we do have a monthly newsletter. In the monthly newsletter it talks about dates and deadlines and changes to the questions and right now the newsletter primarily goes out to the points of contact at the state and one of my goals is to increase that distribution to all of the people who are contributing to EAVS or who have curiosity about EAVS so you can be informed. So, if you're interested in being on that newsletter list, please come and find me. We

will be sending out information about that hopefully through the standards Board in the future, as well.

We are also investing a significant amount of time this year in some working groups which I will be talking about in a little bit. And those of you who have completed the EAVS may notice that we have lost a customer satisfaction after the 2022 cycle so we can get direct feedback on how we can improve the process and have a baseline. That customer satisfaction survey was fielded right after you have certified your data for this year and so we are starting to see those rolling in now. And we do read all of them and we do read all of the comments from your locals if you are at the state level and so we really do take it seriously, your feedback. We are receiving direct feedback from states in the form of letters and some of you have reached out directly to me and my door is open and we are always going to talk about EAVS if you have thoughts and please come and find me if you have feedback on how to improve the process.

We also have a goal to make the data more useful for all of you and so one tool I want to highlight that you may or may not know about is the data interactive. You can find this tool on EAC .gov under the research tab where you will find copies of previous EAVS reports and this is a different way to visualize and interact with the data rather than having the PDF and the spreadsheet and so if you have not had exposure to this tool I would highly encourage you and it is a great way to do that jurisdiction comparative that jurisdictions have been so helpful.

So, right now we have been in the process of convening working groups for sections B through F. And we have done a similar process which is the voter registration section and those changes were reflected in the 2024 EAVS and the feedback that we received is that elections were informed that if we were going to make updates to the questions that we do it all at one time rather than in increments and these are underway and I know some of you in this room have been participating in these working groups and we have two goals in mind and one is to make sure there is clarity so if there is any confusion in the way the questions are written that we can address that and also to make sure the questions are still relevant. And EAVS working groups are made up only of election officials. And what we are in the process to do right now is another working group to be focusing on the modernization of the collection process and exploring topics and timelines and other ways to make it easier to fill out.

We are hoping these working groups also include vendors because we know that that is a part of the process that a lot of you have vendors that help you with your data collection or baked into your EMS systems and ways to collect the data. We wanted to expand those working groups and if anybody is interested, again, come and find me, I am always happy to have more feedback.

And finally, we are in the process right now of connecting research and interviews with the goal of improving the quality of the data meaning we want to ensure the data collection efforts that you all and we are participating in our true and accurate reflection of elections in your state.

Looking forward we would like your feedback on the potential for a short targeted surveyed this year which I am going to turn it over to Commissioner Hovland to talk a little bit about.

>>BEN HOVLAND: Thank you, Kammi. This is a project that we are excited about and something that we believe there is a need for and we have seen - and that is really a survey instrument that is in the opposite years from EAVS. We have and I am trying to get it called odds and as I understand how acclamation votes work I will call for - and actually we cannot do that - oh, I hear wide support for odds and so I am excited for that! Where we are looking at the survey you know we thought about in a couple different ways and one we have heard loud and clear that people do not really like changes and we get that EAVS is also very large and really let us take on whether it is emerging issues or test questions to figure out if they should be in EAVS or look at specific areas that may be we do not need to look at as regularly. And one of the first ones that we have heard a lot of interest in and I think we are likely to start is around just in really getting a sense of what office staffing size looks like. We have seen that in the Clearinghouse community and certainly it is something that we have seen. But, really for a number of reasons, there is not really a great snapshot of what that looks like around the country whether that is just one, a general lack of information or data that has been collected or offices that have multiple responsibilities and how some of those folks get split up on their time, etc. And so looking at again, a smaller survey here but something that would let us take a deep dive on that and I think one of the other interesting things about this kind of endeavor is again, I don't know that we would need to know that every other year and so we could have a series - of research topics and we heard a lot about in general and it came up again in the ideas lab session is again looking at funding and what that looks like across the country. Again, it really does very, the models and there is not a great snapshot of that anywhere. And so again I think these are areas that we are thinking about with the election staffing that really does feel like probably the lowest hanging fruit and I will let Kammi talk about that a little bit more. And again, as we look at expanding our research capacity, I would love feedback on the areas that would be helpful. And in so many ways to be able to hear what I think about is you know what are - what are the data points that if we are collected nationally may be helpful for you and may enable researchers to do work that would better inform your operations or empower you to talk about with stakeholders or appropriators etc. What are some of the things that you wish somebody would have done research areas around in order to better support your operations. And so again this is an emerging area and I think it is one that there is a lot more work that can be done and there is also a lot of flexibility if there are good ideas here. And so I will let Kammi talk about what 2025 looks like on election staffing, but I wanted to give you that background as you think about areas that would be helpful or ways that the EAC can support you through vehicles like this.

>>KAMMI FOOTE: There was multiple reasons we have honed in on staffing. One is in talking with researchers, they are doing a lot of work on workforce development. This is a question that they come back to. There is another survey that you are all familiar with and probably participating in which is the EVIC (SP?) but there is a small sample size that is extrapolated and so there is not really a lot of actual data on staffing itself. And we know that election staffing with turnover and there is additional questions on that. We recently had some conversations in the Clearinghouse network which is our platform on civic roundtable where election officials are asking each other do we have any data that would baseline about staffing,

because we know that that is helpful. Especially when you are trying to advocate for adding another position in your office to see how other election offices of similar sizes are staffed up.

And then during our working groups when we were reviewing the section on poll workers, there was a lot of discussion there in the section on poll workers is really helpful and wouldn't it be great if we had more information about the full-time employees in our office? And so that is the impetus of thinking about election staffing and I also personally believe that this would be maybe a lighter left then questions perhaps about funding and I would like to hear your feedback on to see if I am right on that. I think some of the very large offices it will take some time to get information. But, most of you all will have a lot of jurisdictions in your states that have five or less FTE and we are also not just looking for a baseline of how many people are in the office whether it is a combined office and what are the gaps? I know for me when I came to the EAC I think five years in a row I asked for another position and of course they gave my predecessor additional FTE after I left, but it was something that would have been helpful to me if I had more information because elections are so unique in their structure, not only in the fact that we have these crazy work hours and we have just the timeline of elections, but also many of us are combined in ways that are very unique. So, trying to get a snapshot - this is not the only topic that came up as a potential, this is the one that we are just sort of leaning towards as perhaps the most immediately helpful. We hope that the survey itself does not take more than 20 minutes or so to complete. We do not want to have a whole lot of questions as Commissioner Hovland said rather than institutionalizing it as a part of the EAVS as a recurring part of EAVS that we can test these questions with that one time snapshot.

So, that is the information about staffing. And that potential topic. Would you like to open it up?

>>BEN HOVLAND: Yes, I don't know if anybody has thoughts on that are questions or whether it is about the EAVS or areas that you see gaps. Secretary Bellows, were you using your hand or just -

>>SPEAKER: Scratching my head and raising my hand (CHUCKLE). I think for the EAVS survey because we are so decentralized across so many jurisdictions and I'm sure Wisconsin and Michigan sent others have similar challenges sometimes and so when you say 20 minutes for election staffing, it will take us - we would have to survey our locals to figure out how many people are in each of those local offices and so I don't know if you have thought about like a model survey with a Google form that we could use to survey our locals so we could then report data to you pretty quickly. Because, if we just get the survey then we are going to have to create an instrument of our own in addition to parsing those responses. And we can do it, it is just not going to be 20 minutes. (LAUGHTER).

>>SPEAKER: I should clarify - I am a formal local, I was not at the state level and so I am thinking of a local jurisdiction, not the data collection at the state level and so I apologize. I am thinking hopefully of your locals that will take less than 20 minutes - it will take longer I'm sure to compile. But, that is great feedback and we are looking at different technologies on how to make it easier to collect the data.

>>SPEAKER: Britney?

>>SPEAKER: Andrew, Nebraska. One of the things that would be useful is the current online tool that you have for the local jurisdictions and we do not currently use it for the whole

EAVS, but I think this could be a good use case for the online tool that the EAVS has the answer to these questions and the tracking that is built-in so the state can monitor the county responses. So, that is a suggestion there. My other comment with election staffing that has come up certainly in our office and for some of our counties, but if they could also include salaries and hopefully people feel comfortable sharing that on the local level. But, at least getting how much are people getting paid and is your office currently being way underpaid?

>>SPEAKER: Britney, did you have a question?

>>SPEAKER: No, I had some feedback and as you do this, you probably have this plan, but it would be interesting to see not only just election staffing, but IT and how they are dedicated to elections and I would be very interested in seeing at the state level and the county level hopefully how IT is dedicated to elections and do they have specific staff that work only in elections and does their IT cover all of the office or all of the courthouse depending on the type of offices you are questioning? Even a breakdown between election topics and some staff may be dedicated specifically to elections camping vs. voter registration vs. SVR S and just that kind of break that would be helpful.

>>SPEAKER: That is a great suggestion, Tanya?

>>SPEAKER: And adding to that, looking at the general rules that they provide to the office, but also demographic information if he could about educational background and years of service and I don't know if the age or stuff, but getting a feel for how close are we to retirement so we all intuitively think about you know the graying of our field and getting a sense of when replacement workers are going to be needed and experience -

>>SPEAKER: Nick?

>>SPEAKER: Just to piggyback on what Andrew was saying, if it is going to be done, I think it should be as granular as possible, because especially at the municipal level in states like Rhode Island, we have 39 cities and towns and I've tried to do surveys of municipalities and it has taken months and the data is never complete and I would love to know what all the different varieties of job titles there are and varieties of salary and pay scales are and varieties of office level staffing are, because at our level, the only one that is advocating for us is ourselves and the state is not going to local town councils and think can you please add a FTE to this election office? And we cannot make those argument ourselves, because we don't have the data to compare ourselves to other cities and towns and it is almost impossible for us to get on our own.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you for that. And one other thing that reminds me of that is different from this project as I guess a sneak preview, something that we have been working on, as well with the University of Maryland has been a little bit of a workforce analysis to think through and really in so many ways a better ability to understand and compare apples to apples, you know? And one of the things that I think about a lot particularly trying to talk about elections at the national level you know I say go to your local election official and you know that is not anybody's title. It may be clerk or auditor or recorder or supervisor of elections or any number of things, municipal clerk, county clerk, etc. and so particularly from our vantage point, at the national level, trying to understand you know this person is actually doing the same thing as that person even though they are under very different sort of titles or offices etc. and so I think a lot of this work in my mind are a part of broader complementary efforts and so I think a lot of this work or this survey will feed into an understanding of that effort, as well. So, just to give you all a sense of you know I hope we are thinking about these things come pensively and I think the feedback

so far has been great. But, we know - we know that there are real challenges in talking about this particularly at the national level. And so again, I appreciate that and I don't want to hijack comments or thoughts or questions, but just want to add a little bit of context there. Mandy?

>>SPEAKER: Good morning. Mandy from New Mexico. I just wanted to share something that I think is probably a pretty uniform challenge and also an idea that came out of the idea lab that the other day. And so I think we are all constantly understaffed and under resourced and trying to figure out the best way to advocate and I think what I have learned as legislators typically we are looking for data-driven information and I think it is really difficult to compare state to state you know county to county and even a municipality to municipality and so an idea that came out and I'm not sure how you get there was consideration of figuring out how can we identify some sort of baseline per voter and cost per policy if that makes some sense and meaning like in our state if we could pool you know we offer these five policies and this is what we can expect as arrange for a cost per voter and trying to help create like you cannot compare us to every state to see what they pay, but maybe they can consider looking at a little bit differently.

>>SPEAKER: That is interesting, thank you. I don't know if folks have seen them, but we have done some work with the University of Rhode Island and some calculator tools and we have got some more coming soon and that kind of reminds me of that conceptually if there is a way to quantify sort of a formula and then turn that into a calculator. And so I want to go around that and I appreciate the comment and thought.

>>SPEAKER: In my formal role used to do test cases and have to provide information for the legislature on what we estimate the cost of a new policy would be just based on what we were thinking and we did not necessarily - somebody who just implement it a policy that we could reach out to and that is what kind of reminds me of as well a lot of times you are doing this in very short order and you have a piece of legislation that comes out and trying to react to it as an association of folks and what that cost may be.

And it could be an area where we could be using our Clearinghouse function and there could be like a mechanism of collecting that cost data and potential legislation.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, I think the challenges I have seen differently than in past years is an unwillingness or looking for something beyond local subject matter experts and wanting to really compare it against other states for various reasons and it is not necessarily enough for us to go and present and something that could really compare states.

>>SPEAKER: Again from the idea lab, there was a group of us that worked on funding scenarios solutions and it was suggested obviously not to shoot the messenger, but you have a pretty robust section in the EAVS survey about collection costs. Even if it was in a form that was put together like a tax form that we could itemize and we really are collecting the same way for the same things because none of that data is collected now and so it would be helpful to utilize this kind of data to get some federal funding that was consistent and standard. And I think it would be valuable.

>>SPEAKER: Dag, we were just talking about before. And we are excited that you all worked on that at the ideas lab and I think it will certainly inform our efforts. You know I think one of the areas again that I think is probably the most interesting and promising for the off EAVS is at least getting a snapshot on cost and I don't know if that is something that we would

need every other year, but to get that more on a Census may be every decade or so. But, again, you know we have seen efforts certainly academic efforts to try to figure it out and actually I saw one recently and I look at Karen, because North Carolina actually I think she is at UNC Charlotte and Martha K and Zach Moore from Kansas, they did this crazy effort to try to basically figure out election costs and at the end of the day from what I can tell did a very good job, but acknowledged that this data is just not out there and so again I just feel like those kinds of things you know may be real opportunities for us to collect that and so it is out there, but people can analyze that and then ultimately utilized that to improve function and voting etc. and I will turn it over to Karen.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioner. So, North Carolina has surveyed and we just have not released yet because we are having to deal with outliers and you are very familiar with trying to address that! Oh, we have to do a survey of the cost of elections in our state because of the bond we have as a requirement to our voting systems and our e poll book. And so within those roles we have written that we followed the presidential election because that would be the greatest cost and so that may be when we consider doing that at some other scale. I think and you are welcome to our survey, obviously, but there is probably some nuances that may require some reduction of some of the questions or some additions. But, it is the outliers that become a little problematic and we are trying to figure that out right now. So, happy to help with that.

>>SPEAKER: I appreciate that and I believe Judd from Colorado has flagged that Colorado has a collection mechanism as well which if memory serves may have been helpful in a recent legislation to get more state cost to pick up which I am sure the locals in the room are jealous of. And interested in and so talk to Colorado. (CHUCKLE)

Any other thoughts, yes, Britney?

>>SPEAKER: When it comes to surveying budgets and election spending in the and 49 survey, I would consider doing that separately with the staffing, because one, the people keeping track of statistics and filling out the survey are not the same people at least in West Virginia that are approving budgets and having that financial information that is easy to access. Also it is not the kind of information you need on a tight deadline right after the election and so while you are scrambling to get that election data which is time sensitive, this is something that could may become later that summer, because nobody is like I need this now and so just some thoughts on separating them from the EAVS.

>>BEN HOVLAND: Absolutely, that was the general inclination, but I appreciate that vote of support for that idea.

>>SPEAKER: I have a follow-up question on that regarding (NAME)? We were thinking about if we were going to be fielding this in the fall this year for a report or data to be released in the spring and you know does that timing seem about right for all of you with the fall being - if it was something regarding staffing, would that be difficult for you? Or is there a better time? To field a survey like that?

>>SPEAKER: Virginia and New Jersey, we know.

>>SPEAKER: Now would have probably been the right time honestly. Because, in North Carolina we have municipal elections in the fall, but the demands are not quite as high in the fall except for New Jersey and Virginia.

Sooner rather than later?

>>SPEAKER: Making the deadline before we go out for Christmas so if we do have municipal elections we do have some time after the elections to get that done.

>>SPEAKER: Back on the topic of the election staffing, certainly among ourselves and in Florida we all share job descriptions and salary ranges and one of the most useful tools that we develop so because we use the County HR and we follow the policy and it makes the budgeting process a whole lot more friendly seeing County employees do not get a raise, my employees do not get a raise, but we found out that the county was like reclassifying jobs and giving raises laterally and we are like wait a minute, we are like eight years behind you people and so my staff member develop a rubric which I would be happy to share with anybody that basically calculates if you had this many years and experience, how much years direct experience and then we plug in all of these numbers and a lot of my staff got some very nice raises going into the budget year. And the county actually loved that rubric process so much that they stole it and used it now to try and keep everybody current as far as all of the county employees are concerned. And so I want to just make sure that I mention that and we are certainly happy to share.

>>SPEAKER: We would love to see that, Paul. And certainly thinking about the other effort that I mentioned that we have been doing on sort of the apples to apples comparison - I need a better title for that, sorry I do not know one - but looking at how these roles exist I think with how the field has changed so much. Certainly since HAVA, but again with a lot of states or a lot of positions that are classified more as a classic sort of clerk role or may be more of a administrative role and the changes in demands and knowledge, skills and abilities that are around technology etc. probably mean a lot of the people in our field are not classified the way we should be. And so we are hoping that some of this work can be useful in that way, as well. I see in the back and then Karen.

>>SPEAKER: Patty Weeks in Idaho. I just want to give you a horror story. Election clerks in my office are at the same pay range as custodians.

>>SPEAKER: And that is why we need to do this! Thank you for sharing that.

>>SPEAKER: And that feeds into what you are saying Commissioner and what was just said. I have been in many conversations where the focus was on you know comparing counties because of voter registration size. That does not necessarily equate to the cost of living or the other requirements within the work of that office and especially when you go state to state, the fact that North Carolina does have strictly election offices vs. Kentucky that have multiple hats that they are wearing in their office. It does not compare and so what we have work to do and I would encourage us to think about it and it goes along with what Mandy was mentioning about metrics and so forth is that we have been making the case based upon data from the UNC school of Government where they survey for the salaries of county employees and presenting the factor much like you said that the role of them have changed and we provide the competency pie so they understand the variety of work and highlighting the fact that we are dealing with critical infrastructure and with PII and financial information because of our finance and so forth and trying to draw the comparison that we touch more and interact with more citizens than any other apartment in the county. That often gets overlooked. And that the complexity of the work and the PII is more on par with tax administrators and register of deeds who are often paid more and that has actually been the case that we have been able to make to

get raises and changes in classification more so than trying to pit our counties against each other because of voter registration data.

>>SPEAKER: That is great. Thank you for flagging now and again, we may be coming to you for additional information to help inform some of these efforts. So, thank you for sharing that.

We have got a couple minutes. I know. All right, Stuart.

>>SPEAKER: Commissioner, I appreciate this panel and the ability to provide feedback to the EAC on implementation of state and local policies by using this data set to our advantage. I am wondering if you may be able to share what feedback you are getting from members of Congress, their staff or executive administration on how they are using this data to either keep federal legislation how it is or to amend it and what type of additional information they would like to see within the survey.

>>BEN HOVLAND: Thank you for that question. That is one where I think that EAVS is useful for data-driven policy conversations and one of the areas that probably is the most relevant in some ways through this I think about a lot is the HAVA grants or grants in this area and so much of what we see is a lack of solid information and you know we kind of go through - we go through this conversation it seems like every year with Congress around the grants and you know we have been trying to provide additional specificity on how they are being used and again because there is not really a great snapshot at what elections cost across the country and you know there often is an information gap there and I think if we are able to do a better job painting the picture, it really helps with that conversation and understanding again that you know as we have long said and everybody knows that elections are run at the state and local level and primarily funded at the state and local level, but there is the federal portion of the ballot and are challenges that come and federal mandates from the NVRA etc. and so being able to do a better job at showing that portion and again, even though, even if you take 2018 forward, the HAVA security grants we have seen are a little over \$1 billion with the best estimate I have seen for annual election cost that MIT is nationally five to \$6 billion per year. And so you do some math there over the last six years and you know the federal portion of the grants that have been provided is a very small amount. But, that is not a story that is easy to tell without solid data. And I think looking at vehicles like this may better equip us to tell that story and show that.

And with that, I'll take Andrew for a final comment, you win and you get the last question of the conference!

>>SPEAKER: Okay, oh boy, big pressure! The other thing that we talked about in our group as well as ideas lab with that concept in mind is for the federal funding and reaching out to Congress and giving them specific numbers that may help you also on this survey track with your election cost and how much of your ballot was federal offices? And that is sometimes hard to figure out, we use that as our method of our counties getting reimbursement from political subdivisions on the ballot and they look at how many ballot inches they had and they calculate that all out. Even if it is some sort of average or percentage, having that information would go a long way. Basically saying pay your share.

>>BEN HOVLAND: Certainly we have heard that comment and give credit to Judd from Colorado who notes that the federal portion is the prime real estate at the top of the ballot. And so certainly something to consider.

I really appreciate the conversation. And thank you Kammi to talk about what we have been up to with EAVS and the research department. As I mentioned I know that you are a little sad, but this is the end of the standards Board. It has been a great meeting from my perspective and really do thank you all for the insightful discussion and feedback over the course of this annual meeting. As members of the standards Board, you are recognized leaders in your states and we hope that you think the standards Board as an advisory board continues to be a valuable resource and you will share the support with her colleagues, state leadership and elected officials.

We also, I want to give a brief shot out here and I know that we get together annually, the executive board more often. But, we really do hope that you have found these conversations valid and we have created platforms and ways to extend the conversation and if you are not in the Clearinghouse network I encourage you to check that out and send an email with the sign-up and great, Kim is on it, it is out! Social pressure here! If you have not done that, please check it out. Again it is really a great opportunity to continue these conversations and I think as we heard this morning and as we heard yesterday there are so many interesting nuances and cool things about our jobs as commissioners to go around the country and see the great work that you will do and see some of the differences. I know at conferences like this we like to talk about them, because that is what is interesting. But, I do think that it is important also to remember that even though there are all of those differences, the things that we all have in common are that election administrators are professional, they follow the laws of their state and they do so with transparency, but when we get together it is fun to talk about those differences. I have certainly enjoyed it and I want to say thank you to the EAC staff again for making this happen and I just showed up, look good and made some jokes! And so really - so much of the team went into making this happen from our subject matter experts to the travel team, our comms team and General Counsel and General Counsel hot on the spot reading orders from the bench up here and I am glad that I did not have to do that! And certainly our IT team, as well. And also this was the first time that we ever did a joint standards board meeting and that has never happened before and again, because those are our two largest advisory boards and we have done standards board and board of advisors before and we added up a few dozen of our friends to this week and so certainly I recognize that that has been an extra lift and I want to recognize Steve Daitch who is the ADFO and Kim Smith who is the ADFO for the standards Board and also Kristin, Karen and I don't know where Karen slid off to, but certainly appreciate those efforts and last but not least, Dag, thank you so much for the amazing job facilitating the meeting, your work in the chair this year and we say thank you for that.

Thank you all for being here and with that I will give Dag the final word!

>>DAG ROBINSON: Thank you, Ben and thank you for all being here and this really gives us all reason to continue and before we wrap up I think Kim has something to add for us?

>>KIM SMITH: I am about to hit send on an email with reimbursement information for you all and so I just want to flag that. Even if you cannot be reimbursed for per diem in those things, please fill out the form just to tell us know, that way we will not follow-up and continue to bug you. Just want to say that.

>>SPEAKER: And if you want your money, sign-up for the Clearinghouse network! That is not true! Yes, Dwight?

>>DWIGHT SHELLMAN: I would personally like to just stand up and give a round of applause to our commissioners and the staff of the EAC. You guys are so important to us and we value you and thank you for all of your work!

>>SPEAKER: Tom got a selfie of that! Which he will tell people that was for him. Tom's standing ovation. We really do appreciate that and thank you so much for that.

>>SPEAKER: Does anybody else have anything good for the order before we adjourn? All right, with that being said I entertain a motion that we adjourn the 2025 annual meeting of the EAC standards board.

>>PAUL LUX: So moved.

>>SPEAKER: Second.

>>SPEAKER: Thank you, I hear a few. All those in favor of adjournment say aye signified by saying aye

(MULTIPLE SPEAKERS)

aye. Opposed? We are adjourned, thank you all!