Jim Walsh: Good morning. My name is Jim Walsh; I will be directing our meeting this afternoon. I would like my fellow Commissioners to introduce themselves. Pardon me?

Douglas Kellner: I'm Doug Kellner

Andrew Spano: Andy Spano

Gregory Peterson: Greg Peterson

Jim Walsh: Around the table, we'll wait for the other two to get back to introduce themselves but in the meantime.

John Conklin: John Conklin

Risa Sugarman: Risa Sugarman good morning.

Kim Galvin: Kimberly Galvin

Anna Svizzero: Anna Svizzero

Brian Quail: Brian Quail

Kathleen O'Keefe: Kathleen O'Keefe

Bob Brehm: Bob Brehm

Jim Walsh: Our guests please starting to the right, to the left.

Michael Hennessy: Michael Hennessy from the 121st Assembly District Candidate

Jimmy Vielpiper: Jimmy Vielpiper from Capital New York

Bill McMillan: Bill McMillan Libertarian Party of New York

Aimee Allaud: Aimee Allaud League of Women Voters

Rick Carlin: Rick Carlin, Times Union

Shaikh Aman: Shaikh Aman, Board of Elections IT

Dennis Girard: Dennis Girard, Board of Elections IT

Todd Valentine: Todd Valentine

Jim Walsh: Thank you all. And what is your name sir?

Joseph Burns: Joseph Burns

Jim Walsh: Thank you. We open our meeting with a vote to approve our minutes. Has everyone reviewed the minutes? Oh, one more, what is your name sir?

Tom Connolly: Tom Connolly

Jim Walsh: Tom Connolly thank you for attending.

Douglas Kellner: I move adoption of the minutes as directed.

Andy Spano: I second

Jim Walsh: All in favor?

[Chorus of ayes]

Opposed.

And your name sir?

Bill McCann: Bill McCann

Jim Walsh: Thank you Mr. McCann. Now I'd like to also take the opportunity to thank Brian for attending his first meeting today and getting us off to a good start and we're looking forward to working with you for a long time. Welcome.

Brian Quail: Thank you very much

Jim Walsh: Unit updates, Executive Bob Brehm and Todd Valentine please.

Todd Valentine: Well we've been focused a lot on the independent petition filing period and the challenges that have been with that a very large number of challenges that have independent petitions which has taken a lot of effort on the staff and reflected in Anna's document which I don't want to steal her thunder that she's put together. And we're continuing to work on the other major projects that we're dealing with and when we get to IT we can talk about that on NYESS Voter Refresh and of course we're still trying to move along with the redesign for the Candidate Financial Disclosure database as well.

Obviously, Brian has come on board and we've added more personnel. So we're looking forward to the election 5 weeks from now.

Bob Brehm: In addition to the items that Todd covered, Tom Connolly and I attended a meeting at the invitation of New York City's Executive team Mike Ryan, Dawn Sandow and Pam Perkins to meet with David Becker and his team from PEW to discuss the electronic registration information center that was on the 18th. It was another opportunity to discuss what some of the activities that are happening around the country. They're estimating that by the end of 2015 they'll have 15 perhaps a little bit more states as part of that program and also they wanted to inform us that they're going to also offer another round of funding for states that participate to help with that first year communication requirement to persons that are not presently found to be registered. So it was an interesting meeting.

One other items, Todd and I are also going to do the IT report so we'll save some of that for that portion, but with regard to personnel, we're still working to fill the IT Director position. We have requested Todd and I to meet with state civil service to review some of our options and once we complete that we may come back to you with some recommendations, because we are not yet ready to find, we have not identified a person to fill that position yet. And in addition to Mr. Quail who started yesterday, we had another person start since your last meeting and that's Jaime Salm as one of the Compliance Review audit positions. She started yesterday also. So I believe that will generally be the personnel items.

Jim Walsh: Thank you very much. Council and Compliance, Kim Galvin and Kathy O'Keefe.

Kim Galvin: Yes Commissioner thank you. Our unit has been very busy, there's been an extremely large number of specific objections filed against the independent petitions as was stated that has taken the entire staff of the building to work through and they have been augmented if you will by court cases all over the state that we're trying to deal with. Just when we thought the cases were winding down, we got served with 2 yesterday on judicial nominating conventions. So, that's taken a lot of time. Tom's been handling the Department of Justice for us on the UOCAVA valid issues, he's been doing a great job of the surveys as he always does.

Compliance is doing their very best with the staff they have to do thousands of compliance reviews and following up on all of the phone calls that come along with sending out deficiency letters. The Comptroller's office was here yesterday is my understanding on the Public Financing. Kate Orsino and Vicki Gonzalez have done the job on that, a lot of great work there and I believe that they were suitably impressed with the status of that program as it stands right now whether or not we'll have a qualified candidate is still a mystery. They are in contact with the one candidate that has shown interest and filed the application. But there has been no qualifying match submitted so

far for us to move forward on, and of course, we have the numerous calls from staff and county boards of elections and things regarding ballot access issues and ballot format layout and the like. Kathleen.

Kathleen O'Keefe: Just to supplement what Kim has said, we've had three reports, the 11-day pre-primary, the 10-day post primary and the 32-day general. Obviously that's generated a lot of work for the Compliance Unit. We have approximately, based on what we've already reviewed, about a 2/3 record of compliance. So we're actually quite pleased with how this is working out. The more we do these, the more people seem to be doing them correctly so that's very good news. And obviously as things improve, the work that is generated when they're not in compliance is reduced. So this is a good sign.

Gregory Peterson: Is that the second go-round? I remember last month we were at about 1/3. These are the ones you sent back and came back?

Kathleen O'Keefe: Exactly. So now we're at about 2/3 compliance so that's really quite good.

I want to reiterate about what Kim said about Kate and Vicky. They have done a phenomenal job on the Public Financing Program on a very short timeframe with limitations in our system and the Office of Comptroller, I understand when the staff came here were very impressed. I heard that as well so thank you both of them.

The Independent Expenditure link went live in June and we have approximately 80 disclosures that have been made at this point. They can be viewed on the Independent Expenditure link on the website under Campaign Finance.

We are continuing to talk about the new FIDS system and the thought is perhaps to have subgroups that will address the areas that they know the best and talk to IT about that.

We have had a couple of other cases that are not the straightforward petition cases that candidates are vying in court. We had the one case where the redistricting proposal had been challenged. The judge issued a decision there. On 2 of the 3 challenges the judge rejected the relief sought so that the proposal and the form were not held to be advocacy language and were not held to be unconstitutional. The judge did order us to take out the work Independent which we did. We didn't replace it with anything else, we just left the rest of the language the way it was. And then recently we had a second case that's been brought with respect to the ballot configuration for the Comptroller race, the Attorney General race and one county DA. We are expecting a decision from the Albany Supreme Court today.

And that's really about it.

Jim Walsh: Thank you. Election operations, Anna please.

Anna Svizzero: Thank you Commissioner. We have our monthly report is in your packets but I will summarize it here for you and Joe if you could remind me if we've missed anything in here. We have provided the revised language to the county boards and have worked with the PIO Unit to make sure that those translations get done and we'll be sending those out. All the other translations were done and completed and provided to the Boards and to the two primary printers in the state that handle a lot of ballot work for the county boards. We are working with boards in building ballots both for Election Day and Central Count Systems. We're working with them on questions they have concerning Test Deck and other pre-election testing requirements. Our staff is divided up by region now so that county boards can contact a specific person so there becomes a familiarity there with the county and now they do business and the people that are doing the work there. So it opens up communication a little bit. A lot of that ends up being off the record but it is helpful.

We are working Clear Ballot for their Central Count submission to us. Their source code review is done by their lab. It's being sent to our lab. Once our lab completes a build, we'll actually have product here that we can do functional testing on. So when that happens, we'll make sure that you are aware and share those dates with you in case any of you are interested in working with us on that and then there's a component of that that we do publicly. We post that on the web and boards are invited as is the general public.

We have from ES&S last month we shared with you several engineering change orders that did not require testing, this month we had more engineering change orders from ES&S. Some of them do not require testing and we're required to advise you of that which we're doing today. Some of them do require testing. Initial testing was completed on them as part of the Election Assistance Commission's certification of their voting system. So those source code reviews are going to go to our lab. We'll do the review and we do feel as does NYSTEC our consultant that we need to do some functional testing to make sure that nothing else is disaffected by these changes. So we'll be scheduling that as soon as the software package is delivered to us.

As with everybody else in the building, we have been preoccupied with all of the filings relating to the Independent petitions and also with Supreme Court. 419 petitions were filed, 188 acceptances, declinations, objections, etc. 111 objections I have on our report, 47 sets of specifications were field in the Independent petition filing season which just wrapped up a short time ago.

Supreme Court filings 20 nominations were received from 7 judicial districts. 60 candidates were nominated. We have 3, our report says 2 but we did get an objection in yesterday so we have 3 objections to Supreme Court nominations as of this morning.

Joe do you have anything? I don't have anything else to add.

Jim Walsh: Commissioner Kellner.

Douglas Kellner: Could you just review what you're doing with respect to ballot usability issues with the counties and continuing the education process to get them to improve the usability of their ballots?

Anna Svizzero: We are preparing the statewide component of the ballot. We're trying to add Supreme Court to it just this morning but when we certify the ballot we'll be sending those samples so the boards will be aware of the layout and we also provide pointers to use the largest font possible, to use san serif font, to not use party emblems in the voting squares. The statute says that boards are not required to do that, but there are a number of boards that still do. And having those party emblems inside the candidate square on the ballot is confusing for the voters. They see that as an oval already filled in. It's confusing for boards when they do their post election audit because some of those emblems look like votes cast. So we're looking to enhance that list of the tips that we provide for usability. We're looking for more white space and bigger font size etc. We do incorporate some of the flush left and other language that has been in some of our legislative packet proposals and has been shared with us by the government.

Douglas Kellner: So are you sending out explicit guidelines to the counties for the ballots?

Anna Svizzero: We do it in a best practice format, yet.

Douglas Kellner: And then I noticed in the exhibits that were attached to the papers that were submitted in the Cahill case to Judge McDonough that you had three different formats for the yes/no boxes on the ballots that were submitted and I seriously question whether a usability person looked at how the yes/no was set up, especially where the marking oval is immediately to the left as opposed to on top of the yes/no. Because they are so close together it looks like, at least I think it's possible, that some voters will think that they're voting yes while marking the no oval. So I'd like you to look at that again and to just check for consistency on why some seem to be well set up and some of them are not of those 3.

And then another question I had is in New York City when we had to go into a second row because of the number of candidates exceeds the capacity of the voting machine, the numbering of the box, and of course I support the pending legislation to get rid of the numbering of the box and I would urge the boards to make that number in as small font as possible so as not to be distracting, but that the City policy was always to keep the numbering consistent so that if it overflowed the row it wouldn't change the number, or wouldn't change the, if you were running for Governor you'd be given #1 even if you were in row L or column L in the overflow instead of giving additional numbers for the

boxes. Now I understand that back in the old days with some of the voting machines upstate that you needed the numbers to match the counter numbers in the back of the machine, but that doesn't make sense to continue doing that now and it's confusing because the voters don't' realize that they're all running for the same office and therefore the numbering ought not overflow. If I had a copy I could show you just what I'm talking about.

Anna Svizzero: I think I have a New York City copy.

Bob Brehm: I guess this one's a little bigger.

Douglas Kellner: And then there's a second issue in this sample here which is that the…

Anna Svizzero: These are just drafts I brought them down for exactly this purpose but they haven't been reviewed.

Douglas Kellner: Right. Well you did it this way following the City model because everything is labeled 1 so all the candidates for Governor and Lt. Governor have a 1 and the same for Comptroller they all have 2. But that's now it appears on the upstate ballots. On the upstate…

Jim Walsh: Do we have that ability on the Diminion system?

Douglas Kellner: Well it's just what the numbers assigned.

Anna Svizzero: Well upstate, I'm not sure…

Douglas Kellner: In other words, you have…but there are columns. The Governor and Lt. Governor should be in giving the ballot position should all have, in my view, should all be 1. So that I'm looking at this ballot here.

Kim Galvin: Does the legislation speak to that?

Anna Svizzero: But if you also, excuse me Kim. In the Governor's contest because the race has to be wrapped, you would have 2 candidates with the same ballot position. I agree we should get rid of the letter and number.

Douglas Kellner: No they're row, so Michael McDermott and Chris Edes, their row should be J. It should be labeled 1J and that's consistent with how you put the city ballot together.

Anna Svizzero: But there is no J row on the upstate…

Douglas Kellner: There's no J column on the city ballot either. The city ballot, first of all it should be consistent. It should be the same rule in New York City or upstate and not one rule for New York City and a different rule for upstate. And I think the City rule makes more sense and is more usable from the voter's point of view because it's clear on the City that you're voting for the same contest and that's less clear on the state ballot if you're going to use the numbers. I mean I'm in favor of abolishing these numbers but the only reason they used to do it this way on the upstate ballots was for those voting machines where you needed to know the ballot position in order to read off the number from the back of the machine.

So look I'm just raising it. I'm asking you to look at it and to review it.

There was another issue is when you're wrapping columns or wrapping rows that the candidates of the same party should be physically in the same column regardless of how the wrap works. And the example that

Jim Walsh: The 1C and 2J

Douglas Kellner: On the exhibit one of them did not have the columns consistent and so you had candidates of the libertarian party all listed in J but not in the same column. I don't have what was attached yesterday. Is that the court paper? I'll show it to you.

Todd Valentine: That was a draft that had not been reviewed yet so it was still a long way from done and a work in progress. So it's misleading to think that that was complete in any way.

Douglas Kellner: Alright well that's what I'm raising because with the Independent bodies, when they're wrapped, if they should be wrapped in a way that the Independent body is in the same physical column or same physical row as the ballot and not if in one contest there are 12 candidates and in another contest there are only 9 candidates, the independent bodies column doesn't move so that it's not in the same…

Todd Valentine: It's supposed to appear in the same column or row, yes.

Douglas Kellner: Okay well that wasn't the case on one of the ballots attached to the court.

Kathleen O'Keefe: Just to be clear the judge signed the order shall cause directing that the Board product examples of the ballot but the papers that I submitted I did say these were drafts. We were not finalized with those at all.

Douglas Kellner: Well okay and I just emphasize that we really need to be paying attention to the ballot usability rules because I mean that's our job and we're supposed to be professionals here.

Kim Galvin: Well we follow the statute.

Douglas Kellner: To the extent that we have to follow the statute yes but we're not and by the way putting them in a different column does not follow the statute in my view. And how we assign the column and row numbers, I mean the format governs it but in my view when you're doing a ballot wrap the numbers should be the same for all of them even though it's wrapped into a second column. That's my recommendation but I'll leave it to the staff to do it, I'm just asking that they pay attention to these usability issues. And the same with the yes/no. I think this layout with the yes on top of the circle, the no with the wide spacing is very usable.

Anna Svizzero: But not what the statute says. Right.

Douglas Kellner: Well and the format to the City is usable.

Jim Walsh: Anna do you have any further comments?

Anna Svizzero: No I think I'm pretty light. I have lots of notes to take back when the meeting's over with. Thank you.

Jim Walsh: NVRA PIO, John Conklin.

John Conklin: Thanks Commissioner. I did manage to get a written report in your packet this month so I don't really have anything to add to that. I think Tom has a couple of things he wants to just raise quickly.

Tom Connolly: Yeah I mean I was going to first and most important I wanted to thank all the counties who all did certify to us that they got their ballots for military and overseas voters out by not later than the 45th day before the election which was last, well they got them all out by last Friday which was actually the 46th day. So I want to thank them all for their efforts for getting all those out.

Next important deadline is next Friday which is the 32-day deadline for counties to get the state and local ballots out to military voters. We did remind all the counties on a conference call we had yesterday but I will remind them again here at this meeting just in case they're listening just to remind them that there will be 2 ballots for military voters this year, 2 separate ballots; one for the federal offices and one for state and local offices. We do this just to make sure that there's no confusion and that we keep good statistical data for the Department of Justice reporting that we have to do and also for the reporting we have to do for Judge Sharpe's order. Beyond that, John and I have been involved with IT and both election ops and compliance with regard to the development of Fidas and CAPAS the redesign. We were able to participate in some demos of software that other counties and agencies use to kind of get some ideas. And also in case it's not

mentioned in the IT department report, we did ask county boards to send to us any poll site changes they may have made just so that we can have the most up to date listing of poll sites so that for our website when we use the poll site look up tool and when we provide that information to other agencies that also provide tools, that that information is the most accurate it can possibly be.

Other than that the only thing is that we are working on getting the newer translations for Prop 1 with the language changes. Otherwise the other translations have been completed and were given to the counties and are posted on the website.

Jim Walsh: IT Bob Brehm and Todd Valentine.

Bob Brehm: We miss Dave Loomis but in order to fill the gap because it is taking us a little longer to identify a replacement, we do meet weekly with the senior people in the unit to try and complete what are the projects and what are the priorities and when there's a question. So Todd and I had been meeting with the staff. In addition to meeting with the staff, we are very grateful that Dave Loomis' unit that he went to, his cluster has agreed to make him available to us during the transition period. We're very fortunate to have that happen and we meet weekly Todd and I with Dave Loomis and with Adam Gignet who is the cluster leader of our group as well as it rotates with one of our senior staff members in the room just so we can make sure that our IT projects do not slip during this period of time. So that is continuing to happen.

The major projects CAPAS and FIDAS is the Campaign Finance Candidate Management System. We have a project manager on staff. Last meeting I think we discussed that we are continuing to work to identify the resources to keep that program going. All of the approvals to hire the resources have been received and it's just a matter of doing the solicitations and going through the resumes for the people responding and get them in place. So it's quite a process to get that approval to be completed so that was one of the items we all worked on. So we're happy that we believe that the process is finally in place to get the help in the building for that project.

One other one that is a major project that you did vote for the money a very long time ago which is the NYSVoter Refresher Program. It took us somewhere around 16 to 18 months to redo that contract. We went through 3 versions that Todd and I signed but we finally had it approved in time for the last meeting and the project manager is on staff now so Raj is the project manager for the CAPAS FIDAS system VJ is our project manager for the NYSVoter Refresh. For NYSVoter we found a day between getting all of the certifications done and the general election we think October 8th is going to be great for the kick off meeting because there is no great date, its about the least worst date that we could tend to fit in and still have the attention of people for the initial kick off. And from our perspective the initial kick off is really to make sure that our internal IT staff are consultant IT staff and the state IT staff, at least from a principle get on the same page and with our senior team. And then we'll bring in, once we know they're on the

same page, that we have to bring in some of the county board stakeholders. But we knew we could not do that in October when they're getting the ballots out and doing everything that they need to. So we think we could squeeze in an initial kick off meeting on October 8th to keep this project moving at least to get all of the state IT people at least to be on the same page. And then we'll just have to work a project plan forward to make that happen. So that was good news.

We have a lot of cooperation from the counties and from our people to set up the Election Night Reporting. This primary was one of the more complicated ones we have had. Last year the kick off program was based on 6 yes or no questions on the ballot. That went well. The federal primary in 29 counties was pretty simple. It was a few people in a primary but for one office. That went well. And this year's primary we had an awful lot of candidates running in all kinds of processes and we did notice some capacity issues that significantly impacted what we could post or what people could see were being posted. So we have been working with the IT staff to come up with a full evaluation of that and we are setting up the load testing programs now and we believe that we have made the accommodations but we are going through the test within the next week or so to make sure that we can meet that capacity issue. Because it has been working very well. The counties have cooperated well and we are able to display an awful lot of information very quickly on election night which is something we have never been able to do before. I would like to say that we were about the only state that didn't have the numbers and now we do. And we notice there was a little hiccup there in the primary but it's been a high priority to make sure it doesn't replicate itself.

Other than that I think the report highlights most of the other items. Todd if there's any other?

Todd Valentine: No those are the 3 main projects that we're working on.

Jim Walsh: Very good report for a person that's not in charge of that unit. We may want to hold back retiring next year.

Bob Brehm: No, no no

Kim Galvin: No you don't.

Bob Brehm: Don't let DOB hear that.

Jim Walsh: Well done thank you. Enforcement Risa Sugarman.

Risa Sugarman: Good morning Commissioners. We are well underway. We are conducting our investigations. The Enforcement e-mail we are getting notifications and contact through that. We are conducting interviews for our audit staff and I hope to speak with all of you during the Executive Session.

Jim Walsh: Thank you. No old business, new business. Vote on petition rulings. Kim will you guide us through that please?

Todd Valentine: Do you want to do it or?

Kim Galvin: Yes. This is the standard report and petition reviews,

Todd Valentine: There is a table in everybody's packet.

Douglas Kellner: Supplemental staff report?

Todd Valentine: Yes title Supplemental Staff Report, it's a 2-page document.

Kim Galvin: Might be front and back mine is.

Douglas Kellner: Well what are the new rulings we're making?

Bob Brehm: all of these are new from your previous.

Kim Galvin: That's right.

Todd Valentine: Since our last meeting, these are the objections that have been filed, petitions that have been filed and the objections that have been reviewed and it's divided into our usual 3, several sections.

Douglas Kellner: Alright so you want me to read it? So we're declaring invalid the petition for McMillan, Felix and Fischer for Governor, Lt. Governor and Comptroller.

Todd Valentine: Right these are all independent petitions.

Douglas Kellner: Alright and that's prima facie?

Todd Valentine: Correct.

Douglas Kellner: So the next line McMillan and Felix for Governor and Lt. Governor invalid that's based on rulings on specifications in addition to the prima facie?

Kim Galvin: That's correct.

Todd Valentine: Correct

Douglas Kellner: And then hearings we're ruling that Hester Kohn for Assembly in the 98th District is valid.

Then you have 3 invalids that are off by court order, so that's not us.

Todd Valentine: Correct

Douglas Kellner: Then you have Gibson for Senate in the 41st District invalid and then skip the next one because that's court order, then Bowman for Senate 5th District petition valid, Arnold for Senate 62nd District petition invalid, Venidido Senate 8th District petition valid, Roberts for Assembly 103rd District invalid, Hennessy Assembly 121st District invalid. So that's what we're voting.

Kim Galvin: Correct.

Douglas Kellner: Alright so I move that we approve the staff report.

Jim Walsh: Second?

Gregory Peterson: Second

Jim Walsh: All in favor?

[chorus of ayes]

Opposed? Carried.

That concludes that section of our report.

Kim Galvin: That gentleman is raising his hand.

Douglas Kellner: Are these it?

Todd Valentine: Yes that's all of it.

Jim Walsh: Oh I'm sorry, yes.

Male: Could I interject this morning? I'm the candidate for the

Jim Walsh: If I may please, we do not set aside a portion of our meeting for public speaking however there are always exceptions to be made and with the permission of my fellow Commissioner's we'd be more than happy to hear from you for a short presentation. Is that alright with fellow Commissioners? Okay please go ahead.

Michael Hennessy: I want to thank you, I want to thank the 3 counties I ran in the Board of Elections Offices were very cooperative, very professional and did a good job.

Gregory Peterson: I'm sorry sir, what is your name?

Michael Hennessy: Michael J. Henessey. Running against the 12-term democratic assemblyperson is not easy in the first place. During that time period I went out with friends to get an independent line and we got close, we got over 1700 signatures. We threw out some pages that were *[garbled]*.We worked very hard at doing that and we do not agree with your recommend, the recommendation that came in front of you. In fact I was here a week ago, I drove from Sherrill, New York a 2-hour drive and I expected to be able to go line by line because I don't have the capacity to be able to look line by line on my own. I don't have the finances or the people or the technology this late in the game. At that point I was not given the chance to go line by line with ideas of where I would have been able to convince your group to put back signatures. In fact I want to point out that in the court order that was sent to my house on September 2nd that we did not get until September 4th which has been dismissed because of improper service or would have been proven to be improper service had it continued. So we come back to the Board of Elections here and you've got a different number. In fact the number they submitted to you is a different number. 3 different numbers and the people working on it right now as I speak because we are going to take this to the court can't figure out which number to use. The process is wrong, no one is getting the independent line because of the way your rating this. It's absurd to have to get out 1500 signatures well after all the other signatures have come in eliminating many potential signatures. The law as far as can one witness a democratic signature and then sign somebody else's who's witnessing that signature then carry was told me one way in the first 4 weeks of getting signatures and the last 2 weeks I was told what I thought to be the right way and would have given us another 300 or 400 signatures easily was not even known amongst this office. The rules are so ridiculous, and this is supposedly a progressive state where you want people to participate. You want to give people a chance and you make it so difficult for anybody that runs on a third party line or excuse me an independent line. I've seen this process, I've seen it so tilted where and I can't go into too many more specifics about it because we will be subpoenaing people actually in this room. I feel that the process is wrong. I feel that we weren't given any fair chances. I didn't even get a receipt, I did not pick up until the 9th of September the knowledge that we're not just going into court with, we're now going through the Board of Elections. And I have proof that will be submitted at that point when it needs to be.

I was told I could not win in here. Obviously when I look around and I don't see the lawyer representing the petitioner or the petitioner himself whose never showed up at anything, in fact a local paper is picking this story up right now as we speak and he doesn't even know what I did wrong or what our group did wrong getting signatures and he sends it to a political person in that county to try to answer the report. This has been a political move to keep me off the ballot to protect a long time democratic incumbent and we're going to have our say in court. I appreciate you allowing me the chance to talk here, to express my disappointment in the process. I'm not going to argue with you over

a signature here and there, that should have been done last week and we'll take it to the appropriate arena in the next few days. I want to thank you for your time.

Jim Walsh: Thank you Mr. Hennessy, you were very gentlemanly and professionally put. We will not have a go back and forth. You are possibly subpoenaing members in this room here so we would not continue this discussion. So I wish you well in your future endeavors. Thank you. And your desire to run for public office a compliment to you.

Douglas Kellner: Before we go to Executive Session I wanted to raise one new matter really just as a heads up now that I would hope to have on the agenda for our next meeting a discussion of our 2015 legislative proposals and in particular to discuss language on the ballot usability. That we would propose the revisions to the canvass procedures and the electronic poll book legislation. And then early voting I realize might be more partisan but the other 3 I would hope that as the election professionals we can at least have a discussion on trying to get the ballot usability canvass procedures and the electronic poll book authorization legislation straightened up from a technical point of view. And there have been drafts going around and I haven't gotten any response on the drafts.

Jim Walsh: Alright thank you. I don't know that we have decided on a meeting date for our next meeting or are we on hold for that? We're on hold? Okay.

Bob Brehm: Can we agree to the one we have to have? We have to have one by December 15th so at least we can get that one going because I know it's Monday December 15th in order to certify the general election we have to meet by that date.

Jim Walsh: December 15th?

Bob Brehm: December 15th.

Todd Valentine: Under the statute.

Bob Brehm: So we have to meet not later than that date for the purpose of certifying the results and if we meet any earlier there's a good chance somebody won't be here since we always have to chance after a few counties who will be nameless. So we have to have one close to that date. It's a Monday. If that works for you we'd like to try and fill it in before it becomes less available. And then certainly we'll need something to take place before then.

Jim Walsh: December 15 anyone have any problem with that? Tentatively set for

Andy Spano: Is that December 15th?

Bob Brehm: Monday, December 15th.

Jim Walsh: Any other will be on hold, notify the membership and the public of the next meeting date. Is there a need to go into Executive Session? I believe that Risa stated that. I'd like a motion to go into Executive Session.

Douglas Kellner: So moved.

Jim Walsh: Second?

Gregory Peterson: Second.

Douglas Kellner: Alright we're moving to go into Executive Session.

Bob Brehm: Okay we're back live. So we have to vote to go back into open session.

Andy Spano: We voted to go out of it to open session.

Jim Walsh: All in favor of coming into public session?

[chorus of ayes]

Any votes to be recorded or…

Douglas Kellner: We're talking about adjourning to our next meeting on Thursday November 6th.

Jim Walsh: Good. Same time same place. All in favor of adjourning say aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Opposed? Carried. And away we go.