

**United States Election Assistance Commission
Public Hearing**

RE: National Voter Registration Act (NVRA)

Hyatt Regency Grand Cypress
1 Grand Cypress Boulevard
Orlando, Florida 32836

Wednesday, August 18, 2010

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

The following is the verbatim transcript of the Public Hearing of the United States Election Assistance Commission ("EAC") held on Wednesday, August 18, 2010. The hearing convened at 3:06 p.m., EDT. The hearing adjourned at 3:42 p.m., EDT.

PUBLIC HEARING

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

Okay I think we're ready to start our meeting for our public hearing. And we have Mr. Boehm sitting in front of us and he is going to give us an update. This is on the NVRA. We're really trying to bring our -- really, the rules up to date to what the form is, and I'll let Bill go into it in more detail. But FEC, once HAVA was passed, did the form, but not the rules. So, we are in the place of doing that, along with a few other things.

So Mr. Boehm, I'll turn it over to you to give us a brief or whatever presentation you would like to do before we ask for, if there's people that would like to testify.

MR. BOEHM:

Thank you Madam Chairs, Commissioners, Mr. Wilkey and Counsel Nedzar, today what I'd like to do is discuss the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, i.e. NPRM for short, containing EAC's proposals to amend its regulations applicable to the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, or as commonly known as NVRA. And I'll go into some of the background and the content of the Notice, as well as some next steps. As you know, EAC authorized placement of the NPRM in the *Federal Register* via a tally vote on August the 2nd, 2010. The Notice was published in the *Register* on August 9th. And before I go on, let me just emphasize that none of the changes in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking will be considered before the

2010 election, and there will be no changes to the national form until after the election.

As you know, the purpose of the NVRA was to expand access to voter registration for all American citizens. And in order to achieve the goal, the statute requires States to provide voter registration at motor vehicle agencies, at State public assistance offices, and other designated State and local agencies and registration through the mail. The Federal Election Commission had original responsibility for the NVRA and issued the first set of regulations on June 23rd of 1994. The regulations have not been updated since that time.

In 2002, the Help America Vote Act, or HAVA, transferred statutory responsibility for administering the NVRA from the FEC to the EAC, including authority under Section 9(a) of the NVRA to issue regulations for developing a National Mail Voter Registration form. In 2003, the FEC, prior to the formation of the EAC, incorporated the HAVA requirements into the national mail form. In 2006, EAC, in consultation with the States, updated the State instructions to reflect HAVA requirements that went into effect that year. However, until the regulations were formally transferred from FEC to EAC, the EAC could not propose any changes to the regulations. A lack of a Commissioner quorum at the FEC delayed the transfer of regulations until 2009. In that year both Commissions published a notice in the *Federal Register* announcing the transfer on July 29, 2009. And it became effective a month later on August 28th.

According to the NVRA, as amended by HAVA, EAC is charged with three major responsibilities. First, it must provide information to the States with regard to their responsibilities under the Act. Second, it must develop a national mail voter registration form. And third, it must submit a biennial report to Congress following each federal election regarding the impact of the NVRA on the administration of elections for the two previous years. The NVRA limits EAC's regulatory authority to prescribing only those regulations as are necessary to design the national form and to submit the biennial report to Congress.

It's against this backdrop that the EAC approved the NPRM to incorporate changes into the NVR regulations that are consistent with the Help America Vote Act. Prior to the issuance of the NPRM, and in anticipation of its role related to updating the NVRA regulations, EAC held several meetings and a public hearing from 2007 through 2010 on the issues of implementing the requirements of the NVRA.

In the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, EAC establishes a lengthy public comment period of over 90 days from the date of publication in the *Federal Register*. The deadline for comment is 5 p.m. on November 23rd of this year. The lengthy comment period is based on the testimony received by the Commission at its NVRA public hearing in 2007. The majority of those testifying called for a "robust" comment period. From the date of its publication in the *Register* until November 23rd, EAC invites input regarding the proposals and requests for comment contained in the NPRM from

chief State election officials, local election administrators, advocacy groups and the public.

EAC will accept those comments received via regulations.gov, e-mail and through postal mail. Just a note about the comments, all submissions must include the Commission's name and the regulation title, EAC and the National Voter Registration Act, for this information and collection recordkeeping requirement. And there are instructions on regulations.gov to that effect. All comments received will be publicly posted, including any personal information received. EAC will post comments without change unless the comment contains profanity or material that is prohibited from disclosure by law.

Also, EAC will conduct hearings, such as this one, during the comment period, at which, the Commission can receive input from the public. The details of each meeting will be made available on the EAC's website as they become available.

Once the comment period closes, all of the comments and testimonies that the EAC has received will be reviewed and considered as the Commission moves into the next phase of the process, which will end in the issuance of a Final Rule, which will most likely be the beginning of January in 2011.

The Notice does indicate that EAC may consider more than one Final Rule, one that deals with the HAVA requirements, and an additional Final Rule that might pertain to other non-HAVA requirements.

After publishing the Final Rule or rules, the Commission, based on public comments and available evidence, may consider

alterations to the design of the national voter -- the national mail voter registration form. The Commission would consult with chief State election officials on any redesign of the form, as required by the NVRA.

The public comments and testimony received during this public comment period may also assist the EAC in determining what type of guidance to provide to States regarding their responsibilities under the NVRA. The last time, I believe, guidance was offered to the States by the FEC was 1998.

Let me address now the content of the Notice as it was published in the *Federal Register*. It includes several proposed changes to the NVRA regulations. The proposed changes are within the limited scope of authority granted to the EAC and address HAVA-related requirements. To be clear, as the Chair said, the proposed modifications to the regulations reflect changes to the federal form that the FEC made in 2003 to reflect HAVA's requirements.

The primary objective of the Notice is to modify the NVRA regulations to make them consistent with HAVA requirements and the HAVA changes already made to the federal form. The proposed changes to the regulations fall under the following categories: HAVA requirements, HAVA-related requirements and technical amendments. A secondary objective in the NPRM is to ask for public comment on other issues of interest to the EAC.

What are the HAVA requirements? HAVA specifically requires three questions: Inclusion of questions and checkboxes asking applicants to indicate whether or not they're U.S. citizens

and they're age 18 -- or whether they're age 18 in accordance with Section 303 (b)(4)(A)(i) of the Act; Inclusion of a statement advising applicants if they checked "no" in response to either of those two questions, they should not complete the form; and, (c) Addition of a statement informing applicants that if they're registering for the first time, the required voter identification information should be submitted with the national mail voter registration form to avoid the additional identification requirements upon voting for the first time. All of the foregoing are specific requirements of the Help America Vote Act.

In addition to the statutory HAVA requirements addressing what must be on the federal form, there are procedures which result from the HAVA requirements that EAC proposes to include in the regulations. These HAVA-related requirements include:

Authorizing, in the regulations, the statement, now appearing under the question and checkbox, pertaining to age. This statement appears on the form to alert applicants that their State might allow individuals under age 18 to vote in primaries that precede the general election or States that, in fact, may allow under age 18 pre-registration.

Secondly, a change in the format of the federal form. The current regulations prescribe a card format for the form that makes it impossible for voters to submit the HAVA-required identification documents via the mail. The NPRM proposes modifying the regulation to allow the form to be printed on paper stock and mailed in an envelope to the appropriate address. This proposal gives voters the option of avoiding additional identification requirements

upon voting for the first time, by allowing them to mail the identification with the completed national mail voter registration form, which is consistent with HAVA. This practice, by the way, has been used for the last few years.

Clarification of the State-specific instructions regarding State voter identification requirements is also necessary. HAVA exempts voter registration applicants who will be voting for the first time, and registering by mail, from enclosing identification documents under certain conditions that could vary from State to State.

With regard to the technical amendments, there are a couple of them. They include ensuring that there are no existing references to the FEC in the regulations, adding references to HAVA where a requirement is contained in both the NVRA and HAVA, eliminating internal references to dates that no longer have any relevance such as the beginning date for States to certify the information for the first biennial report to Congress, and adding an amendment that requires a Privacy Act notice on the national voter registration form.

Finally, there are other possible issues that can be addressed in the regulations, but not required or addressed by HAVA. But because they're not required by HAVA, EAC asks for public comment on them, but does not propose them as amendments to the NVR regulations -- NVRA regulations in the NPRM.

These issues include asking for comments on: One, the use of an electronic web based form; a proposal to add additional information on the form such as the applicant's e-mail address and

boxes for the applicant to check whether the applicant is an overseas citizen or military voter, covered by the Uniformed and Overseas Citizen Absentee Voting Act; and three, changing the deadlines for States to certify information to the EAC for the NVRA report to Congress from March 31st to 90 -- that would be March 31st following the federal election year, to 90 days after the date of each regularly scheduled general election for federal office. This is the deadline required by UOCAVA for the certification of UOCAVA information, and it is obtained by the EAC through the same survey instrument.

That concludes my testimony, and I'd be happy to answer questions that you might have at this time.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

Commissioners, questions? Commissioner Hillman?

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Commissioner Beach might want to ask first.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

Do you have some questions?

COMMISSIONER BRESSO:

Oh, yeah, I just have one question regarding timing. I believe the public comment period closes November 23rd?

MR. BOEHM:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER BRESSO:

And since we're in the middle of a federal election cycle, if we get comments from States indicating that they may need more time to comment or digest these materials if they do want to comment,

given the election cycle, would we be able to extend the comment period?

MR. BOEHM:

I believe you can extend the comment period.

COMMISSIONER BRESSO:

Okay, that's all I have, thank you.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

And I think that it would be nice for us to also say that we're going to have a hearing in California the month of October...

MR. BOEHM:

October 14th.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

...so that people can also testify from that area if they would like to do so. I think it's October 16th. Is that correct?

MR. BOEHM:

14th.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

14th?

MR. BOEHM:

14th I believe, Thursday.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

Thank you. Commissioner Hillman?

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

I do have a couple of questions. Following the Commission's adoption of the regs, the new regs, when do the changes take effect? Do they take effect immediately? Or is there a lapse

between when they're adopted or approved and when they take effect?

MR. BOEHM:

I may have to defer to Counsel on this. She's shaking her head.

MS. NEDZAR:

Under the Congressional Review Act, when an agency adopts a Final Rule, we have to provide notice to the leaders of the House and Senate and the Comptroller General, and provide 30 days from the adoption of the Final Rule as the effective date. And there are some exceptions to that, but that's the general rule.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Okay, thank you. And I realize it's only been nine days since these were posted in the *Register*, but to your knowledge have we received any comments yet?

MR. BOEHM:

I have not -- I checked the e-mail when I left Washington Thursday. There had been no comments received up to that point, and to date I don't believe anything was filed with regulations.gov.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Okay. In the middle of your testimony, and I'll just read this back to you, "After publishing the Final Rule, the Commission may consider alterations to the design of the form. The Commission would consult with the chief State election officials on any redesign of the form as required by the statute." What are the options that would be available to us to do that consultation?

MR. BOEHM:

You mean, how would we go about consulting with them?

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Yeah, I'm just trying to see what the process might be and what additional time there might be to accomplish that.

MR. BOEHM:

The first thing that we're going to have to do, of course, is to review the comments and to see if -- we ask, specifically, for example, on how folks felt about inclusion of e-mail addresses, whether they would check boxes on military and overseas voters. The comment period, of course, does suffice for the requirement to consult with the States on revising those regulations. If we find that there's a reason to include additional information on the form and have to redesign the form, we would have to go to the States and work with them to find out if what we've come up with is a workable solution, that can be done through a comment period. That could be done through, you know, making the form available to them and asking for input or, you know, things...

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

So, that might be another 30 days?

MR. BOEHM:

It could be longer, yeah.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

It could be longer?

MR. BOEHM:

Right.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Okay. And under the HAVA-related requirements, your number three...

MR. BOEHM:

Right.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

...clarification of the State-specific instructions regarding State voter identification requirements. Could you just, for the record, elaborate on that a little bit, as to what that means, as best you know?

MR. BOEHM:

There's a provision in the law that basically says, and this was a HAVA requirement, I believe, that basically said, if the States have a -- have the ability to check -- keep in mind this is back in 2002 -- have the ability to check a driver's license number or the last four digits of the Social Security number, and compare that on a statewide database, then the applicants would not have to apply -- submit voter identification documents with the form. Back in '03, '04, '05 there was no -- a lot of States did not have a statewide database. In '06, when the EAC modified their State instructions, that was the reason that they were modified, so that they would update that information. The instructions from each State could be made to reflect the fact that if they had the statewide database in effect, then the documents wouldn't have to be included with the form.

So, for the most part, that's been resolved, but we need a modification to the regulations to cover that specific requirement to accommodate the instructions that would be placed in each State's -- each State has their State-specific instructions on the form and

each State was modified, back in '06, to reflect that requirement.

So, it's been done for the most part.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Staying on that point for a minute, new voters, and I can understand why, get confused about the identification requirements for using the national mail-in form, and what that says about the type of identification that's required, and what you have to provide when you go to vote if you hadn't previously provided that, versus what a State might require of a person when they show up to vote anyhow, and the identification requirements might be different. So, the specific question always is, do I then have two voter identification requirements, identification to satisfy the NVRA rule, and identification to satisfy the State's voter identification requirements?

MR. BOEHM:

Well, each State, after HAVA passed, had to identify in their own laws what kind of identification requirements would be provided. I believe HAVA contains a list of those identification requirements. For the most part, those identification requirements should be the same. And there is a notice on the form, especially those who register by mail for the first time, that includes the specifics of that HAVA requirement. Now -- but while the instruction is on the form, it is not required in the regulation. And that's one of the things that the NPRM proposes to do in the regulations, is to update the reg to require that specific instruction. I'm not sure if that really answers your question.

The State-specific instructions also contain information relative to the voter identification requirements for each State.

So...

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Right, so it is possible that if I register to vote using the national form, and I do not -- I choose not to mail in the identification for privacy concerns, but would prefer to show it in person when I go to vote, that's permissible. Correct? That is, I can show the identification when I go to vote?

MR. BOEHM:

That's true. But the other requirement, though, is that you provide a driver's license number or the last four digits of your ...

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Right.

MR. BOEHM:

...card. If that's provided, you don't have to provide voter identification information either...

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Okay.

MR. BOEHM:

...because your State will do a check with your statewide voter registration database to verify those numbers.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

So, two different scenarios, I provide the driver ed -- I mean the driver's license number, or I provide the last four digits of my Social.

MR. BOEHM:

Right.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

And the State, then, has a requirement for all voters to show identification at the polls when they go to vote.

MR. BOEHM:

Not necessarily. Are you saying that's the scenario?

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

This is my scenario.

MR. BOEHM:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Okay? So, I provide the digits, but my State requires identification when I go to vote, even when I've been registered for 30 years. So, I have to, then, also provide that identification when I...

MR. BOEHM:

No, you would have to comply with the State.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

NVRA does not exempt that person from -- okay.

MR. BOEHM:

No, but keep in mind that I'm not sure that the form itself addresses those particular issues. What it addresses is what you do if you have applied through that form...

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Right.

MR. BOEHM:

...okay, if you're applying for the first time.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Right.

MR. BOEHM:

If there's additional State requirements, even if you haven't used that form, then you have to comply with the State law.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Right, and so the voter, then, has the responsibility to find out what those...

MR. BOEHM:

Right.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

...additional requirements may be...

MR. BOEHM:

Right.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

...because the NVRA form does not address that?

MR. BOEHM:

Right.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Okay.

MR. BOEHM:

It addressed the requirements if you use the form.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

For registering?

MR. BOEHM:

Right.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

But not for voting?

MR. BOEHM:

Right.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Okay.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

I think that's what the...

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Right.

MR. BOEHM:

That's the result of the...

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

That's definitely...

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Right, I mean, it does get to be confusing, especially if I don't provide the digits, and I don't mail in my utility bill or my phone bill or whatever, and I show up to vote, and I'm prepared with those two pieces of information, but the State, then, has an additional requirement for voters, voter identification at the polls when you vote. NVRA does not cover that requirement, the voter identification at the polls requirement?

MR. BOEHM:

Only if you use the form. I may -- what it does have on the form is the types of -- first of all, it has the notice on the instruction that says first-time voters. And it will tell you that you've got to provide the certain documents when you vote, or you can include them on, you know, when you mail in the form. It also advises you to look at your State-specific instructions, and there it tells you that if you

provide the numbers you don't have to provide the information. So, there's like three different levels there.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Right.

MR. BOEHM:

If you don't provide the numbers, you provide the documents with the form, I believe. I believe that's the instruction. Let me see if I have it here. I don't have that form with me. It, basically, says, "First-time voters who register by mail" and that's all it applies to, is if you're voting...

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Um-hum.

MR. BOEHM:

...for the first time after you register. "If you're registering to vote for the first time in your jurisdiction and are mailing this registration application, federal law requires you to show proof of identification the first time you vote. Proof of identification includes," and then, it gives you, you know, the list, "A current and valid photo identification, a current utility bill, a bank statement, government check -- paycheck or government document that shows your name and address. Voters may be exempt from this requirement if they submit a copy of this identification with their mail voter registration form. If you wish to submit a copy, please keep the following in mind. Your State may have additional identification requirements which may mandate you show identification at the polling place, even if you meet the federal proof of identification." And then, it, of course, says, "Do not submit original documents with this

application, only copies.” The additional provision, though, is what I talked about before, was, if you provide the numbers on the form those two -- one of those two types of numbers, you don’t have to meet this requirement either. This instruction does not accommodate that -- doesn’t have that information in there. And what we would propose to do is to also say, “Please see your State instructions” because the State instructions follow-up with the specifics regarding the ID numbers.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Not too confusing, even though the form provides a wonderful service and opportunity for people who want to register to vote. Just a tad bit confusing, but I suppose that’s the domain of federal law.

MR. BOEHM:

Well, indeed, those are the things that we will look at after we receive the public comments to determine, in fact, whether those kind of issues need addressed.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Right, I think that’s my last question. It is.

And I do want to say, Madam Chair, thank you for agreeing to try to reach out to get people to come in to testify. I’m a little concerned that we don’t go through California without more people taking advantage of our presence to testify, and hope that we will start, soon, aggressively looking for people who would accept an invitation to come and testify, because the people we need to hear from, it would be ashamed if we get to the end of the process and people say the form is still confusing, without having taken

advantage of an opportunity to help us provide what could be good clarification. Thank you.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

My question is more of a statement I think, and correct me Mr. Wilkey, if I'm incorrect, but just so that I think that you're aware, before, when we've had hearings on this, the form itself was talked about by not being really easy to fill out, people would leave things blank, it really needed to be looked at, because it was past due of improving the form itself. So, whether things were changed or not, I think we still have the responsibility of looking at that form, making sure that it is a form that is accessible or usable, I guess, is what I want to say, to the voters. So, I think that we need to go ahead and start thinking about how we approach that with the election officials and -- to be able to really accomplish that within a short time period.

Tom, am I correct on that?

MR. WILKEY:

Well, you are correct. And you've really -- whether you've done it on purpose or not, but you've really struck a nerve with me because of my longstanding work in the literacy community. I mean, the form still has a lot of problems with literacy issues. That is why States have chosen to use their form -- utilize their form more than the federal document. Unfortunately, when some of the language was passed during HAVA, so much attention was being paid to the provisions in HAVA, and all of the things in HAVA, that some of the issues that related to the federal form got overlooked and, frankly, made it even worse than it was before.

What really needs to happen is to have a really good professional group of people who are involved in literacy issues to take a look at it. How much they can do, because so much of it is in statute, we may not be able to do. But I think back to the days when we redesigned our form, and followed the path that the District of Columbia took, back then when Emit was there, and really became the first in the country to work with this literacy community in developing that form. In fact, we copied it in New York, took up a lot of those issues. It does need a lot of work because it's still in many areas -- we don't tend to look at it, but we don't have the problems, we don't have the issues. When somebody who cannot read or comprehend, or is at a level of comprehension that is much different than ours, takes a look at it, they have issues with it. And that's kind of what I'm addressing.

So, I'm not sure how much of it we can get done without going -- having the Congress look at it, because some of the language that is required is statutory, and we wouldn't be able to do much with that.

But thank you for the opportunity...

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

Okay.

MR. WILKEY:

...to, again, get on my soapbox on that issue.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

The other thing is in our next hearing, yes, we do want to reach out to the one in D.C., and to the one in California, to different individuals. And the one in D.C., I really want to -- we haven't

called them as yet -- but to reach out to the Justice Department and FVAP for comments on it, you know, and then, anybody else, obviously, in the community and reaching out to community people to be able to testify on it. So, that's that goal of the one in D.C. that's upcoming.

So, is there any other questions for Bill at this time? I think we have one person that signed up, Connie Schmidt, she is here. And I don't know if we had anybody else sign up or not. Nobody else signed up. So, Connie, thank you.

You can stay Bill, you're fine.

MS. SCHMIDT:

Okay, thank you very much. As a retired election commissioner, I know the significance of this NVRA voter registration form, and I wanted to quickly applaud your efforts and the time and the energy you're putting forth to study this issue, and to get it as simplified and easy for the voters to use, and for election administrators and the State officials to process, and make that whole thing worthwhile.

The one thing I wanted to point out, after listening to this part of the testimony today, is, I think it's really important that you also provide this in an electronic format. The ability to put that form out there and have it be a fillable form eliminates people accidentally forgetting to fill in a spot because the form wouldn't allow itself to be printed unless all the required fields were filled out. It also eliminates the age-old problem in election offices of trying to read handwritten information, which is often entered incorrectly into a computer system. And I'm also thinking that this is an absolutely

wonderful opportunity if a person is registering on, let's say, an EAC website using the national form, and they type what State they're in, that the form should automatically provide information to them, as Commissioner Hillman was saying, about what is required in that State. So, it becomes a very interactive tool that, basically, gets them all the information they need by doing one thing as going online to register to vote and fill out the form.

So, I applaud you and I'll be -- I hope other election officials across the country take the time to think about this very important topic and provide you with input. It's an opportunity for us to tell you, so thank you very much.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

Thank you, we appreciate your efforts of coming forward and testifying.

I definitely want to make sure that the audience and anybody that's listening to us today knows that they can go on the website and make comments and those will be considered just like everybody else, and they will be there. So, definitely, we encourage the public to make comments on what we're doing.

Any other statements by any of the Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

Well, I just want to say, one, to thank Connie Schmidt for taking the time to testify. I mean, she hit all the points that I think are really important. I have heard registrars complain about not being able to read the handwriting on the form, and I think technology provides an opportunity for an interactive form that one doesn't allow you to submit an incomplete form. But I think the suggestion of the form

taking the voter right to their State, so they can see right then and there what the State requirements are is an excellent idea, if we can work it out.

Thank you.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

Commissioner Bresso, do you have any comments?

COMMISSIONER BRESSO:

No, I'd just like to thank Ms. Schmidt for her testimony. And I look forward to hearing from others at our upcoming hearings.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

Thank you very much. Do we need a motion to close the hearing?

I think that...

COMMISSIONER BRESSO:

No.

COMMISSIONER HILLMAN:

No, I think you can just close it.

CHAIR DAVIDSON:

The hearing is concluded. And we do look forward to comments.

Thank you very much for hanging with us today.

[The public hearing of the EAC concluded at 3:42 p.m. EDT.]

: