
Commissioner Berger: I'd like to welcome everybody to the meeting of the State Board of Elections here on December 9, 2025. My name is Henry Berger, Co-Chair of the State Board of Elections. I'm joined by my Co-Chair, Commissioner Peter Kosinski, and Commissioners Essma Bagnuola and Anthony Casale. We'll start today as the State Board of Canvassers for the purpose of certifying the November 4, 2025, General Election results. And I asked staff to review the paperwork necessary for us to sign certifying the election results. Has staff done that?

Amy Connolly: Certainly, Commissioner. Happy to do that. We have prepared for the Board of Canvassers results for 11 of our Judicial Districts, as well as our statewide proposition and a Special Election for Assembly District 115.

Commissioner Berger: Thank you. Is there a motion to certify on the state level of the canvass that's been circulated to the commissioners? Is there a motion?

Commissioner Bagnuola: So moved. Sorry.

Commissioner Berger: Is there a second?

Commissioner Casale: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Any discussion? Hearing none, let's proceed to a vote. All those in favor, please so indicate.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye.

Commissioner Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. Is there anybody opposed? Hearing none, this matter is adopted unanimously. I think we have completed our signing of all the necessary documents. Is that true?

Brian Quail: Yes.

Commissioner Berger: We have signed all the documents and we will continue. There being no other business, is there a motion to adjourn the canvassers?

Commissioner Casale: So moved.

Commissioner Berger: It has been moved. Is it seconded?

Commissioner Bagnuola: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Any discussion? All those in favor, please so indicate.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye.

Commissioner Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. Opposed? Hearing none, this matter is adopted. So I now call to order the meeting of the New York State Board of Elections. We have the same cast at the moment. The first order of business is to approve the Minutes of the August 6th, 2025, and September 10, 2025 meetings. Are there any amendments to the Minutes prepared by staff? Hearing none, do I have a motion to approve the two sets of minutes?

Commissioner Casale: So moved.

Commissioner Berger: Is there a second?

Commissioner Bagnuola: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, please so indicate.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye.

Commissioner Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. Any opposed? Any abstentions? Hearing none, that matter is adopted. We will now have unit update reports. Executive Directors, who's going first?

Kristen Zebrowski-Stavisky: I will go first, commissioners. Thank you. The Co-Executive Directors worked with staff throughout the agency, as well as with the county boards and other state agencies, on several issues since our last board meeting. First, I would have to say that the November 4th, 2025 General Election went well. In addition to Supreme Court, as you just heard, there was a state ballot proposition and the Special Election in the 115th Assembly District. As you know, prior to each election event, the Secure Elections Center convenes our federal, state, and local partners for a coordinated approach. After the initial kickoff, we have daily check-ins for law enforcement, transportation, utilities, Chamber, and if issues arise, the standing meeting time is activated. As always, I want to thank our partners for their participation and coordination. The Secure Elections Center and our pre-election event partnership is truly a model for the rest of the country.

And I wanted to thank the staff here at the Board for all of their work. I continue to be honored to work with this team. I would be remiss if I ended the general election discussion without acknowledging the manual recount in Rensselaer. The Rensselaer County Board of Elections

initiated a comprehensive review of results to ensure the continued accuracy and integrity of the vote count. During their post-election verification, a formatting issue was identified after the initial programming of the ballots. It was found to have affected some ballot styles used in the election. All indications led the county board, and in fact, the State Board to believe this was limited to the ballot propositions in certain towns. However, the Board determined that a broader review was warranted to leave no room for uncertainty. As part of this review and out of an abundance of caution, the Board conducted a full manual hand count of all contests from the 2025 General Election.

All of New York's election laws are designed with checks and balances to identify and address issues like this should they arise. This process reflects those safeguards working as intended, ensuring the integrity of every result and the confidence of every voter. The system works. The processes, procedures, and safeguards in place find anomalies. This was a human error. The tabulators worked exactly as they were programmed. The State Board worked closely with Rensselaer and offered assistance. The recount was conducted by bipartisan teams following procedures established in state election law. I want to publicly commend Rensselaer, their commissioners and their staff. They went above and beyond and executed a recount process conducted openly and jointly by Republican and Democratic election officials to reinforce the confidence in the accuracy and integrity of our elections. And their recount numbers are updated in the certification that you just approved and you know, the system works, and it's nice to see that what we have in place really does illustrate that when there are issues, we find them and we correct them.

Okay. Moving on to OVR and AVR. Since the May 2023 deployment of online voter registration, through both the State Board and the New York City portal, 735,063 New Yorkers have used the online portal to register. Since our last unit report, over 26,000 New Yorkers registered just through our online portal. These numbers are extraordinary, and I just want to be clear that online voter registration has expanded the franchise and encouraged engagement and participation. We continue to monitor the usage and seek to raise awareness. The numbers utilizing OVR continue to rise and we continue to work on enhancements, particularly within the context of the agency-wide software currently under development. Our goal is to streamline systems to provide the most efficient, effective systems for all of our constituent groups: voters, county boards, the general public interested in public reporting, and our governmental partners.

AVR, automatic voter registration. Our partnership with the New York State ITS to implement AVR and the clearinghouse necessary to transfer information efficiently between the State Board, county boards, and the AVR agencies continues. We meet weekly; technical teams have regular meetings; and phase one is nearing completion with three agencies set to connect to the State Board's clearinghouse in the first quarter of 2026. We've also finalized the business requirements for phase two, which is the paper forms from the AVR agencies, and we continue our collaboration with those AVR agency partners, and we thank them for all of their help.

Also, software related, the State Board and PCFB integrated software. As you know, MTX is the vendor that was chosen, and they have been onsite since March 2024. They continue to work

closely with Deputy Directors Connolly and Lovullo, CIO Laura Baker, our business units, and our IT unit. PCFB eligibility and in-district verification were completed. They are currently finishing matching and payments and working towards integrations with the state financial system. Public reporting has been developed, testing continues, and we have had multiple meetings with stakeholders, including advocacy groups, treasurers, media, and other, as we call them, “super users.” We are currently reviewing feedback provided by those groups, including the Brennan Center, Reinvent Albany, and others, and expect the new public reporting site to go live sometime during the first quarter of 2026. Just yesterday, we held the first requirement session, discovery session with election operations and MTX. So we are now going to move forward into another development that will help us with ballot access and other operations functions.

Other projects, Train the Trainer. We have had kickoff meetings with the Election Center, the vendor procured for the State Board of Elections Training Institute, as established by Chapter 477 of the Laws of 2023. As you know, this directs the Board to develop curriculum for certified poll worker training and Train the Trainer programs. It will include curriculum relating to a diverse electorate, professional delivery of services, assistance to voters with disabilities and limited English proficiency, voting systems, and shall utilize industry proven training techniques. County Boards will enroll at least two trainers to become and maintain certified poll worker instructors. There will be adequate trainers to meet the needs of the counties, and the Institute will help us develop a uniform statewide curriculum so that we can ensure voters are well served across the state.

We have a follow-up meeting scheduled with the Election Center for this month. And as a related note, this is really being spearheaded by the Accessibility and Training Unit, a new unit that Co-Executive Director Riley introduced in our last, I think, unit report, but they are really, that unit is up and running. And I commend Helen Hellmuth and Jen Mainello, sorry, our deputy and our director. They're just going through all of the processes we have. They're working closely with the Election Center. They've been working hard to look through all the accessibility materials to update them. And they already are an incredible resource to our counties, and I'm just really excited to see what that unit will go forth and bring forward in the coming years.

Finally, the voting and elections database, the Dr. John L. Flateau Voting and Elections Database at the State Board. That project is well underway. Our procurement is nearly complete. We started some initial conversations, and in the next months, we'll be reaching out to counties, towns, villages, school districts to gather data. And I think when that is completed, it will be a resource for voters across the state, interested media, interested parties, and just we'll give a broader picture of elections in New York State, so we're excited about that.

We continue a bi-weekly meeting schedule with the Division of Budget. We meet biweekly with the executive branch. We meet monthly with the Office of General Services. The co-executive directors and our staff continue monthly conference calls with the Election Commissioners Association, and we meet biweekly with the Division of Election Law Enforcement. We continue to work on training and guidance to make sure that the county boards are well-equipped

with the tools they need to carry out their duties. And we are looking forward to the January Election Commissioners Association Conference, which will be early in January, January 5th. So that concludes my report. I will turn it to Co-Executive Director Riley for additional comments.

Raymond Riley: Thank you, Kristen. The only thing I want to add, I just want to reiterate our thanks for our partnerships with our federal, state, and local partners. It really is a vital group that we put together for every election in order to respond to any and all issues. I also want to extend the State Board's thanks to the county commissioners and their staff. We had obviously another election in November. We did not have a lot of things that cross county lines, but they were exceptionally busy running local races. And I know I speak for everyone here when I share our thanks and appreciation for all the work that they do every year. That's all that I have.

Commissioner Berger: Thank you. Election operations. Amy and Jude, who goes first?

Amy Connolly: Thank you, Commissioner. The election operations unit worked on providing support to counties leading up to the general election through certification. We prepared the certification documents that were presented earlier today. We also visited counties during early voting and on election day and in some of the days following. We will be resuming acceptance testing beginning next week for counties to accept new voting equipment. We prepared draft calendars for 2026, and we've begun preparing for next year for our ECA conference and to get ready for all of the elections coming up next year.

By way of voting system vendors, we approved three ECOs. Two were for ES&S and one was for Dominion. They were all de minimis changes to the voting systems. Nothing new to report for voter registration systems or electronic poll books, but we did receive an application for an automated audit tool that's a standalone tool that does not have a voting system component that will be presented for your consideration later in the meeting.

Commissioner Berger: Jude?

Jude Seymour: My director summed it up beautifully. I have nothing to add, thank you.

Commissioner Berger: Thank you. Counsel and Compliance: Brian and Kevin, who's...

Brian Quail: I'm up. Thank you, Commissioner. First, I think it'd be helpful to do a quick review of cases that we are contending with. As the commissioners are well aware, in recent weeks, we've had quite a few new ones after a period of relative calm. We have what I'm going to refer to as we have so many, we have two Williams cases now. So I'm going to refer to this one as Williams Two because it's the second time related to the Congressional District 11 redistricting. Basically, it's a challenge to the district configuration. Briefing continues in that particular case and there's a trial scheduled for early January, I believe January 6th and 7th. The Common Cause case remains on the docket, but it was fully submitted as of September. That's the ExpressVote XL case.

In *Frentzel vs. Mohr*, the federal challenge to the OTB write-in statute, the board of course... Well, actually the board is not a party to that, at least not a participating party, but the statute was upheld at the trial court level on a motion to dismiss, and it is now back in front of the Second Circuit. It had arrived there before, and the court held that the posture that the case was in was not ripe for determination, so it went back for a do-over, for lack of a better description, and now is back at the Second Circuit on the merits. And the respondent's brief in that case is due on January 20th. In the *Williams One* case, we have a challenge related to the Equal Rights Amendment and the retirement age of judges, the mandatory retirement age of judges. In that case, there is an appeal pending in the Fourth Department. In respect to *Citizens Audit v. the New York State Board of Elections and the Attorney General*, we have a motion calendar there. The court approved the application to make a motion to dismiss for us and denied an application by the plaintiffs in that case to make a motion.

Commissioner Berger: I'm sorry, what's the issue on that case?

Brian Quail: The *Citizens Audit* case involves a challenge to the voter registration database making a number of claims with respect to it that the board has addressed in various other settings. And essentially, they're challenging the veracity of the voter registration database, and also alleging various dignitary torts in relation to things that either the Board or people at the Attorney General's office may have said in characterizing that. So that's where that is. And it is proceeding at pace.

Commissioner Berger: Thank you.

Brian Quail: The other case we certainly want to mention is the *United States Department of Justice v. New York State Board of Elections* related to the voter registration database also, in terms of the boards providing certain protected personal information. The Board is divided in that case, and the four commissioners are represented separately. And there is a deadline for dispositive motion to dismiss to be made by December 23rd.

In the *American Future Fund* case, this is the case related to the application of New York's *Independent Expenditure Law*. The *American Future Fund* had asked for a preliminary injunction. That preliminary injunction was denied, and they are now taking an interlocutory appeal on the injunction, and that is pending in the Second Circuit. That's it for cases.

As far as the activities of the Compliance unit, slight uptick, we're standing at 7,488 active filers, which we don't normally mention this, but sometimes it comes up in terms of you can be a committee or you can be a candidate that's self-reporting. And occasionally people wonder what the breakdown is between those. So I'm proud to bring those two numbers to you today. Brand new, we've never reported on this before. It is 6,892 committees and 596 self-reporting candidates.

Since the last board meeting, the Compliance unit has been exceptionally busy. They have processed 6,312 reviews; 348 candidates have been registered and 197 committees. And between

candidate records and committees, 864 have been terminated since the last meeting. To also give us a sense of the workflow of the unit, in terms of being a source of information to the treasurers and to the public at large: the unit processed 862 official emails. And this is just emails that come into the agency's CFINFO email. These are generally broader, more general inquiries and doesn't include a number of communications vastly in excess of 862 that would come into individual reviewers. But they processed 862 questions via email.

Only one webinar was conducted since the last meeting, but there were 108 attendees, subject was Winding Down the Committee. The training unit basically has a cadence where they teach people about basics of campaign finance. Then they do trainings about how to actually use the software. And then in encouraging committees to practice good committee hygiene, to encourage people to wind down the committees, a series of seminars on winding down are provided later in the cycle. And that has occurred and is occurring.

In terms of non-filers from the July Periodic, it stands at 957. When last we reported on the July Periodic, it was 1,691. So the number is down, but still not zero. The unit obviously continues to process and investigate dormant committees, actually that's an issue that's very important to the commissioners, it's come up repeatedly, following up on invalid email addresses and committees on hold, and always to consistently address outstanding deficiencies.

Significantly, since the last time we reported, the leadership of the unit has placed a renewed focus on updating trainings, simplifying processes and procedures that create more intuitive and consolidated forms, that are more understandable to the stakeholders, the treasurers, and the candidates that use them. The goal obviously is to get high compliance, but with little complexity or difficulty on the part of the people we're asking to comply. And with an eye toward that as a fundamental improvement, they are spending significant time on making improvements in the forms and the trainings. And then I will pass it off to Kevin.

Kevin Murphy: I have little substantively to add to that. To piggyback off of the comments about updating, with regard to the compliance staff, we did also begin a long-term process to refresh our campaign finance webinars and our trainings that we do for the outside world, for the treasurers and just kind of are taking a more thorough review of the current status of those presentations, and how they can be updated, and streamlined, and improved. So that's a longer-term venture that we started a few weeks ago. So I'm hopeful that that will lead to some very positive results, but that dovetails with what Brian said before.

Just wanted to, as always, thank the Compliance staff for their continued hard work. As Brian said, there's been a number of suggestions that have been made to simplify processes, and improve and condense forms, and really look at the process that we follow and that we ask our treasurers and our committees to follow. And the fact that they are not just looking at getting the work done and doing it well but also coming to us with suggestions for how these processes can improve really makes the unit very strong and continues to make Brian and I look very good at these meetings. So I just want to express our appreciation for that. But otherwise, I have nothing to add until we get to our regulations later in the meeting. Thank you.

Commissioner Berger: Thank you. Are there any questions for Counsel? Hearing none, then we move right into Enforcement. Michael Johnson.

Michael Johnson: The Enforcement unit has been quite busy lately, specifically handling complaints from the last election. The bulk of the complaints obviously come from New York City regarding the mayoral election. And again, we get complaints from all over the state, but a lot of what we're doing is examining the complaints and seeing what actually is an election law violation and what is not.

The ones that are complaints, which there are a lot of, dealing with poll sites, we're compiling all that information and we're going to submit that to the Co-Executive Directors, perhaps Election Ops. So the information will be shared with the county boards to point out the issues that have happened and what could possibly be done regarding those complaints from a county board perspective.

The complaints that deal with, for instance, where they're asking for a recount or things like that, or overturn of election, a lot of complaints come in that simply are beyond the ability for the Enforcement Division. I simply cannot overturn an election. So we get a lot of those types of complaints. We also get a lot of complaints in which require us to do quite a bit of due diligence because people will send in complaints for, maybe they have a personal grudge against a poll worker or something like that. So that requires, okay, a few phone calls need to be made to get to the bottom of it. And also a lot of complaints that come in regarding county boards, you find out that a lot of those complaints don't necessarily, they're not necessarily valid. And I confirm that when I talk to different commissioners, and you find out that there is really no truth behind those particular complaints.

A lot of other complaints come in that don't have evidence. If there is an email, we reach out to the complainant asking to supply, please supply additional evidence so we can investigate the matter. So that's essentially what the Enforcement Division has been focusing on lately.

Commissioner Berger: Thank you. Any questions for Enforcement?

Commissioner Bagnuola: I have a question.

Commissioner Berger: Yes, please, Commissioner.

Commissioner Bagnuola: You said you were compiling complaints that are going to go to other departments. Wouldn't it be easier just to forward the complaint directly so they can address it right away with the counties? Instead of waiting, maybe the counties can deal with something immediately after an election?

Michael Johnson: What we've done in the past is we'll give Ops, hey, here's a breakdown of all the complaints that come in. We compile; it's different category. As far as when the complaints

come in at that given moment, we reach out to county boards. I have to be mindful that during an election, a lot of times the commissioners at the county board are very busy administering the election. And a lot of complaints that do come in on election day are issues with regard to what happens at a poll site, i.e., I couldn't vote because the police officer wouldn't let me in. What person who sent the complaint in didn't understand is, yes, nine o'clock is the cutoff. You have to be in line at nine o'clock. You can't be down the street walking to the poll site and the police officer sees you, and you go, "Well, it's nine o'clock. I want to vote."

So it's a lot of things like that that we have to contend with and let folks know, "Well, it's not an election law violation." So those are things we just don't send to the county boards.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Well, my question is, can you send it to the departments of the state boards – the State Board – to handle immediately or close to, a little quicker than compiling it together, like you said earlier.

Michael Johnson: So in other words-

Commissioner Bagnuola: So if you get a complaint, this is a complaint that I don't have jurisdiction on, I should send it to info right now. Is that unclear? Am I not... Right, so when I was at a board, I got a complaint, it wasn't for me. It wasn't for the person next to me. I would give it; I would take all the information and I would send it directly to the person who can handle it instead of waiting.

Michael Johnson: So in other words, when we get a complaint and it involves a county board, you're suggesting we immediately send it to Election Ops?

Commissioner Bagnuola: Yes. Is that not-

Michael Johnson: We can talk about that and decide if that's exactly how we should handle that.

Amy Connolly: Operations stands ready to absolutely be a partner in that, of course.

Commissioner Bagnuola: I'm not trying to give you guys more work, but if you guys are the ones to deal with it, it should be given to you immediately rather than waiting.

Amy Connolly: Understood, Commissioner.

Tom Connolly: Yeah. The only thing I would add with regard to timeliness is that, as was mentioned by Co-Executive Director Zebrowski-Stavisky, we do have a conference early in January, so I'm not entirely sure when the compilation was going to be available to us, but-

Michael Johnson: Probably the next week.

Tom Connolly: Great, because then that would just... I just want to make sure we have the opportunity to then present it to all of the county boards in January so that they can make whatever tweaks they need to on their end.

Kristen Zebrowski-Stavisky: I think we can do both things, right? I think if there's an issue at a poll site on election day and you reached out directly to Election Operations, hopefully we could intervene-

Michael Johnson: Right.

Kristen Zebrowski-Stavisky: ... and stop that issue from continuing at the poll site.

Michael Johnson: Right.

Kristen Zebrowski-Stavisky: And I think there are also issues at boards or trends that you might see in training across boards that, as Tom said, we hope to address at the Election Commissioners Association so that we can say, "Hey, we've seen a lot of people..." What are some of the common ones? Don't turn on the ballot marketing device, but I know that the HAVA complaints about that have been... I know that counsel's been working very hard to make sure that that does not continue to happen. And we had an example, I think, from New York City, of actual signage on the ballot marketing device that we're going to hopefully suggest that all counties adopt. So I think we can and should do both.

Michael Johnson: And there are also some complaints we're getting with regard to poll sites, like for instance, someone will say, and we get this a lot in New York City, "Well, how come I'm not assigned to a poll site?" Or, "I have a fight with-

Kristen Zebrowski-Stavisky: Oh, yes.

Michael Johnson: Yeah, it's a lot of-

Kristen Zebrowski-Stavisky: Oh, you mean poll inspectors, yes.

Michael Johnson: Yes, poll inspectors.

Kristen Zebrowski-Stavisky: Yes.

Michael Johnson: There you go. So-

Kristen Zebrowski-Stavisky: Yes, we get those emails too, quite a bit.

Michael Johnson: So I have no problem coordinating that kind of stuff. Yeah.

Amy Connolly: Commissioner, to your point, we do have a process in place whereas when we receive those complaints, we address them immediately with the county so that we can afford every opportunity to correct it as quickly as possible.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Right. Okay.

Tom Connolly: And one of the other things I would also mention, especially during the early vote and Election Day periods, is that identification of trends, even if it's just one or two or three boards, allows us sometimes to be proactive. If we need to get messaging out, like I'll use an example, there was some concern about the validity of certain watcher certificates that we were seeing throughout the state. So it might just be easier for us, after we've heard from two or three counties, to be proactive and reach out to all of the counties and say, "We understand that this is going on. You may also encounter this at your board, just so that you know ahead of time this is something that is okay."

Commissioner Bagnuola Yeah. Exactly.

Commissioner Berger: Anything further on this? Thank you. NVRA Public Information, Kathleen and Jen. Who's... Kathleen.

Kathleen McGrath: Good afternoon, Commissioners. To start with PIO's report. Since our last board meeting in August, we have received approximately 200 FOIL requests each month. In total, since the last board meeting, we have received 878 FOIL requests. Of those, we've completed 868, so only 10 remain outstanding and in process. And I just want to mention that I am super grateful to both the IT unit and other units that assist us in processing and responding to those in such a timely manner.

As for the State Board's website, we've made numerous updates to the State Board website since our last meeting. We added new information about our new Accessibility unit. We've published the statewide ballot proposal language. We added information about the special election in the 115th Assembly District, including the political calendar and the certification. We updated portal messages and website pages about voter registration and ballot request deadlines as we led up to the November General. We created a brand-new page about the Dr. John L. Flateau Voting and Elections Database of New York. We ensured voter lookup info was updated, including sample ballots for voters. We pulled and published the November 1st enrollment data. We made our Election Night Reporting website for unofficial results live, and of course, we've published information about today's board meeting, as well as the documents.

We participate with ongoing meetings with our accessibility vendor to make sure we meet and exceed accessibility standards, and we're now doing that with our partners in the Accessibility unit. In terms of language determinations, after the enactment of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Act, we work to ensure all State Board content is created, translated, and disseminated in all required languages, which now includes English, Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Bengali, Malayalam, Tagalog and Urdu. And we've also assisted our county boards in ensuring that their

materials meet their required language requirements. As for that statewide ballot proposal, upon finalization of the language that was done at the last meeting, PIO ensured that it was, the ballot proposal question was translated into all required languages and disseminated to the county boards. We also worked with the New York Press Service to ensure that the proposal was published in newspapers statewide.

Our email service has grown to over 3,300 subscribers. That's up about 12% since our August board meeting, and we've sent out six blast emails since then, including a number of topics that I'll cover actually when we talk about social media. In terms of voter registration and NVRA, since our last board meeting, our NVRA coordinator has conducted trainings with both the SUNY Disability Services Offices and the New York City Human Resources Administration, and we have a training scheduled next month with Veterans' Services. We continue to work with those state agencies to ensure that they're submitting the proper voter registration data to the county boards.

In terms of our UOCAVA and military voting, we worked alongside other State Board units this summer and fall to assist county boards as they transitioned from NYSBallot to Enhanced Voting as the platform for sending ballots to those voters, and it went very well with this new service. In terms of county board outreach, we did present at the ECA Summer Conference last August regarding language access, those UOCAVA voters, and grants. Prior to the general election, we ensured that the county boards uploaded all their poll sites. We coordinated with the county boards during the general election regarding their press interactions, and since Election Day, have worked with them to upload their voter histories from the general. And we're currently preparing to present at the ECA Winter Conference in Albany next month.

There have been 12 visits to county boards since the August board meeting, that includes Chenango, Columbia, Dutchess, Fulton, Jefferson, Lewis, Orange, Oswego, Putnam, Rensselaer, Rockland, and Saratoga. In just the past two-year period, our two members of our team, Dawn Barber and Dan Toomey, have now visited 55 counties, with only Long Island and the city remaining. The 2024 annual report has been finalized and published, and we're already communicating with all our other units here about the 2025 annual report since that's coming soon.

In terms of media, we've responded to numerous media requests through traditional media, including a wide variety of State Board issues, including ballot access questions, campaign finance, the special election in the 115th, as well as our general election timelines, that statewide ballot proposal, the order of offices on the ballot, the implications of the Even-Year Election Bill, those language determinations, early voting turnout, and how parties and independent bodies are placed on the ballot, electioneering, political payroll restrictions, recount thresholds, and certification deadlines.

We've also been busy on our social media accounts. We've published information since the last board meeting about National Poll Worker Recruitment Day, which was in August, National Voter Registration Day, which is in September, the voter registration and mail ballot request

deadlines before the general, our early voting daily posts, our posts about deadlines of returning your mail ballots, election information, a thank you to poll workers after election day and today's board meeting information. We have increased both followers and interactions on all three of our social media platforms: Facebook, Instagram, and X. Facebook is by far the biggest. We've actually had over 71,000 views and almost 2,000 interactions on our posts since the last board meeting, and we're continuing to create content for the winter.

Couple miscellaneous items before passing it to Jen. As Kristen mentioned, PIO has been part of the State Board team, working on the design and functionality of the public reporting application overhaul as part of the greater MTX project. We have held demonstrations and meetings with stakeholders, such as media and advocacy groups seeking their feedback, and we're now reviewing that feedback to enhance the development of the application. And lastly, since the last board meeting, Jennifer and I presented to SUNY's New York Voting Community of Practice meeting, which has representatives from all the SUNY campuses, regarding voter registration, mail balloting, and in person voting options. So now, if there are no questions for me, I'd like to pass it over to Deputy Director Jen Wilson for the grants report.

Jennifer Wilson: Thank you, Kathleen. Since our last board meeting, we received final approval on our contracts for our two new state grants. That is our \$1 million grant for expenses related to the 2025 elections and \$5 million for costs associated with mail ballots. Those contracts were sent to county boards in September, and we're already receiving those back, signed, on a rolling basis, and we're already getting some claims submitted for those as well, which is great. And in addition to those are two new state grants, we continue to administer our eight active state grants.

For our federal grants, in the fall, we submitted our annual report to the Elections Assistance Commission on our HAVA Security 251 and 101 grants. These reports included our federal financial reports and progress reports. Following our visit with the Elections Assistance Commission in August, which went very well, we have begun working on closing out our legacy HAVA 101 Poll Worker Training and Voter Education, and HAVA 251 Shoebox sub-awards.

At the summer conference, we announced that the State Board would be closing those grants out by the coming summer, as in next summer, and counties with funds remaining had until June of 2026 to submit their claims for reimbursement. We sent targeted communications to all the counties with outstanding funds, and already we have had several counties completely spend down those outstanding grants. Currently for Shoebox, there are 14 counties with funds remaining, with a balance of just over \$300,000. At the last board meeting, the balance was \$797,000, meaning that in just those couple of months, we have already spent down that grant by more than half.

For the Voter Education and Poll Worker Training grant, there are 22 counties with outstanding funds of \$993,000. This one's a little bit more difficult to spend because it is a much more specific grant than Shoebox, but we are working with all the counties, all the 22 counties, to get those funds spent by the summer. And that's everything there is.

Commissioner Berger: Thank you. Any questions? On to ITU, SEC.

Laura Baker: Hello, Commissioners. Thank you. The ITU unit has been supporting all of the applications initiatives within the Board. The Flateau Database development is underway. AVR, we have been deep in testing and requirements review for AVR. We are also working on an upgrade for OVR that will connect it to the AVR system as soon as that is ready. We supported the Enhanced Voting cutover and the deprecation of the NYSBallot system, as well as the ongoing support of the MTX system.

In order to support all of these systems, our infrastructure group has been extremely busy. We are at about 90% replacement of all of the network infrastructure in house and throughout the entire state. All of the external connections to the counties have been cut over and all are redundant. A large test of that was our November election in which all systems worked as expected and stayed up and functioning throughout, which was very exciting.

We have replaced the AV in all of the conference rooms, as well as adding a conference room, That's the new cameras here. And this past week, we replaced the phone system throughout the entire organization. In the week leading up to the November election, the ITU jumped into action to support an unexpected closure of the building that closed the building and forced the staff to go to remote for three days. We implemented the new phone system impromptu over those three days and allowed everyone to answer phones remotely, supporting PIO and Ops primarily during that initiative. And the other thing that we have done recently is we've established... I should say we've tried to shore up our user support vertical to support all of the new staff that's being brought on and new divisions that are being brought on. And that vertical is averaging somewhere between 1,000 and 1,500 support tickets a month. And that is what I have. I'm going to pass it over to Ben.

Ben Spear: Thanks, Laura, and thank you to the Board as well. I'll start, as the Co-Executive Directors did, with the 2025 Election. I want to take an opportunity to note, and all of these were publicly reported, that during the election period we responded to a potential active shooter incident, a white powder incident at a mail processing facility for ballots, as well as several spoofed bomb threats on Election Day itself. A special thanks to the City Board of Elections and their partners at NYPD ESU and FDNY Hazmat in responding to several of these incidents, as well as having the processes in place to address them and continue operations, as well as to the county boards who received suspicious emails and reported them to us so that we could coordinate with state police in order to address those.

Moving on from that, for the last several years, one of the first tools we provide to counties in securing the elections is monitoring of the election offices and their networks from a cybersecurity perspective. In the last year, building on that practice and additional grant funds from the federal government, New York State has begun a similar program that protects the entire county, as well as the Board of Elections. And so as counties move to this new statewide system, we will be rolling down that system on our end and have started that first tranche in the coming month here. We're also in the process there finalizing procurement for a new shared

service that will allow us to help secure not just the counties, but also the vendors going forward, as a replacement for this service going away.

In partnership with the election operations team, we are working on guidance as it relates to remote results reporting on election night. Several counties over the last few years, and now even this past year, a vendor has begun offering, and more counties are interested in, reporting that allows quicker reporting of election night results from the precinct to the central board. And we want to ensure that as this expands even further, that there is sufficient guidance around that. So that way it's both done functionally appropriate, as well as securely.

Yesterday we launched our annual cybersecurity training for CBOEs and their IT departments. Next week, we will be launching our new lunch-and-learn webinar series for county boards and IT with a session on data restoration best practices. What this is is we've identified through our recent cyber reassessments; there are several topics that all counties are experiencing a gap in. And they were each leveraging our guidance partner, consulting partner, asking the same exact questions. So as opposed to using multiple county hours for the same question, we decide for these cross-cutting topics to actually have a quick 20-to-30-minute session explaining and also making them aware of the tools available from the State Board or from the state writ large that have been provided at no cost that allow them to meet these without really any additional effort and how to use those.

And then the last thing I have is that, as you know, last year we conducted what we called our cybersecurity roadshow over the summer. We will be planning to do that again and have already established a set of dates for that in the summer of 2026 in advance of the 2026 election.

Commissioner Berger: Thanks for that. Any questions? Our newest unit, Accessibility and Training.

Jennifer Mainello: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I'd like to begin by acknowledging that I'll be reporting out on behalf of our unit today in the absence of our director, Helen Hellmuth, who's currently on parental leave and enjoying time with her new baby, Marley. We look forward to welcoming her back in April.

Since our appointments went into effect in August of 2025, we have been busy introducing ourselves to county boards as well as to local partners. Our goal has been to ensure that they know we are here as a resource and committed to supporting them however they may need.

As previously mentioned, one of our top priorities was establishing a connection with the Election Center to begin discussions on the development of the core curriculum for the Poll Worker Training Institute as required by Chapter 477 of the Laws of 2023. As mentioned, we had a meeting with them in September where we agreed to gather and provide copies of our current poll worker training materials from the counties and any other resources that they might need to help them in their development.

As mentioned, we have a follow-up meeting with them scheduled in the middle of the month, and we are really excited for that. We hope to have more details at our next meeting from what comes from that. So that's what I have to report. Thank you.

Commissioner Berger: Thank you. Thank you all. I guess there's nothing going on, so you don't have much to do. Is anybody aware of any old business? Hearing none, let's proceed to new business. The first item of new business is regulation Part 6201.3, Procedure in Fair Campaign Code Proceedings, Resolution 25-15. Walk us through this.

Kevin Murphy: Sure. In processing a number of Fair Campaign Code alleged violations that will be discussed later in the agenda, it was determined that the regulation relating to the procedure in processing these complaints could use some clarification and a bit more structure. So these regulations are an attempt to bring that procedure more closely in line with the procedure that we already have in regulation relating to our HAVA complaint procedure, which details a lot more structure in terms of how the process is started. And then, if it were to go to a hearing, how those hearings would be conducted.

Commissioner Berger: Is there a motion to adopt Resolution 25-15?

Commissioner Casale: So moved.

Commissioner Berger: Is there a second?

Commissioner Kosinski: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Any discussion or questions? Hearing none, let's proceed to a vote. All those in favor, please do indicate aye.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye.

Commissioner Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. Any opposed? Hearing none, that matter is adopted unanimously. The second item of new business is regulation Part 6210.13 sub 12, Standards for Determining Valid Write-In Votes. Resolution 25-16. Counsel?

Kevin Murphy: Sure. This is a simple resolution to conform Part 6210.13 sub 12 to conform with a change in statute relating to the counting and validity of write-in votes. They were in conflict after a change in the laws of 2023 and are needed to be brought into conformance with the statutory change.

Commissioner Casale: Excuse me. The change means?

Kevin Murphy: The change was for that a write-in vote would be counted regardless of whether or not the candidate's name appears on the ballot.

Commissioner Casale: So if John Doe appears on the ballot, they don't fill in the bubble, but they just write down John Doe? It's got to be on the same line as that office though, correct?

Kevin Murphy: Correct. But that change was made in the laws of 2023.

Commissioner Casale: We can also do all things. Thank you, Kevin.

Commissioner Berger: I'll entertain a motion.

Commissioner Casale: So moved.

Commissioner Berger: Is there a second?

Commissioner Bagnuola: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Any discussion or questions? Hearing none, let's proceed to a vote. All those in favor?

Commissioners Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. No opposed? That matter is adopted unanimously. Third item is regulation Part 6213.4, Voter Registration Transmittal Submission. And this is Resolution 24-17. Brian, Kevin – you did some heavy lifting today, didn't you?

Kevin Murphy: Oh, not at all.

Commissioner Berger: Okay.

Kevin Murphy: This is a change that would extend a transmittal reporting period deadline from weekly to monthly in regards to requirements of county boards transmitting documentation as to the number of registration and change of address forms that they have received just to ease the administrative burden. We determine that a weekly reporting votes is not necessary and that a monthly reporting would be sufficient.

Commissioner Berger: Is there a motion?

Commissioner Casale: So moved.

Commissioner Berger: Is there a second?

Commissioner Bagnuola: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Any discussion or questions? Hearing none, proceed to a vote. All those in favor?

Commissioner Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye

Commissioner Berger: Aye. No opposed? That's adopted unanimously. Fourth item is regulation 6222. Conflicts of Interest Among Board of Elections Employees, and this is Resolution 25-18. Kevin?

Kevin: In-

Tom Connolly: 6224. 6224.

Kevin Murphy: Yes, 6224.

Commissioner Berger: All right.

Kevin Murphy: Oh yes, sorry. And it's correct in the proposed Resolution as 6224. In Chapter 639 of the Laws of 2024 created a new provision of election law relating to banning conflicts of interest among County Board of Elections employees and tasked the Board of Elections, the State Board, with promulgating regulations in that same vein.

So these regulations relate to clarifying the prohibitions on board of elections employees maintaining financial interests in vendors or companies providing services to candidates with an election overseen by said board of elections or vendors or companies that sell election equipment to those boards, as well as a process by which a board of elections employee would be able to seek authorization to seek elective office within the jurisdiction that the board would be covering those elections.

Commissioner Berger: Is there a motion to approve this resolution?

Commissioner Casale: So moved.

Commissioner Berger: Is there a second?

Commissioner Bagnuola: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Any discussion or questions? Hearing none. See if those are all those in favor?

Commissioners Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. I don't hear any opposition. That matter is unanimous. The fifth item of new business is a resolution to Authorize Staff Review of Enhanced Voting LLC Enhanced Audit System. This is Resolution 25-19. Election operations. Is that Amy doing this?

Amy Connolly: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner. The Election Operations unit has received an application for consideration for an automated audit tool by Enhanced Voting. So this resolution would authorize us to proceed with that testing.

Commissioner Casale: So this is for the test, that's not the approval?

Amy Connolly: Yes, Commissioner.

Commissioner Berger: First, we test it, and then we ... Is there a motion to approve this resolution?

Commissioner Casale: So moved. I'm sorry.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Any discussion or questions?

Commissioner Kosinski: Yeah. Can I just clarify, does the vendor pay for this testing?

Amy Connolly: Yes, Commissioner.

Commissioner Kosinski: Thank you.

Commissioner Berger: It gets better all the time. Proceed to a vote. All those in favor, please so indicate.

Commissioners Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. Any opposed? Hearing none, this matter is adopted unanimously. We will now pick up three Fair Campaign Code complaints along with recommendations from Counsels' office. The first complaint is the Lemondes determination. Will Counsels' office walk us through this please, whichever one is good?

Brian Quail: Happy to do that, Commissioner. This complaint involves the presentation of an image during an ad and an allegation that a mislabeling of a document, which is a transcription of judgment as a tax warrant rose to the Fair Campaign Code level of a fraudulent, forge, or falsely identified writing.

We have case law that says that in the context of the Fair Campaign Code, in order to keep it constitutional, that the Sullivan vs. New York Times standard needs to be met. While there was a mis-description, which apparently was ultimately changed by a candidate running the ad, it certainly does not rise to the level of a fraudulent or a falsely identified writing in the sense that it was intended by the Fair Campaign Code.

So the joint recommendation of the Counsels' unit is that the matter be closed. And the details of that recommendation are obviously in the recommendation of counsel that's been provided to the commissioners.

Commissioner Berger: I think we've seen those. Is there a motion to adopt the counsels' recommendation?

Commissioner Casale: So moved.

Commissioner Berger: Any second?

Commissioner Bagnuola: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Any discussion or questions? Hearing none, let's proceed to a vote. All those in favor, please so indicate.

Commissioners Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. That's four of us. No opposition. That's adopted unanimously. The next Fair Campaign Code complaint is the Wiggins determination. Counsel?

Brian Quail: In this particular matter, the issue revolves around a use by a candidate of the name of an organization alleging that that organization had endorsed the candidate. Very clear and factual assertions were made with excellent documentary proof indicating that the organization did not endorse the candidate and on multiple occasions insisted that the candidate stop saying that the organization had endorsed the candidate. The candidate persisted with communications indicating that the candidate was endorsed, that notwithstanding.

Accordingly, in order for the board to proceed to the possibility of imposing a sanction, the statute requires that a hearing be held. And would provide yet an additional opportunity for the candidate to produce facts and opposition. The recommendation of counsel is that the matter be assigned to a hearing officer and proceed to hearing.

Commissioner Berger: Thank you. Is there a motion to adopt counsels' recommendation?

Commissioner Casale: So moved.

Commissioner Berger: Any second?

Commissioner Bagnuola: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Any questions or discussion? Hearing none, proceed to a vote. All those in favor, please so indicate.

Commissioners Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. Four of us, so it is unanimous. Thank you. That matter is adopted. The final Fair Campaign Code complaint is Stefanik. I am told there are two recommendations, one from the Democratic counsel, one from the Republican counsel. Who's going first?

Brian Quail: I will describe the contours of the issue. The issue involves a poll by Elise Stefanik or our organization related to, about ... actually, I should say, Elise Stefanik running for governor. And the results of that poll, and the allegation is, that the poll needs to be disclosed pursuant to the provision of the FCC that says that if you disclose the results of a poll within 48 hours, you have to file with the Board additional information about the poll and its contents so that people can judge that poll.

There is an exception to the release of polls related to testing of waters by testing of waters candidates; people are not yet candidates, I should say, and they're still testing the waters. So that if such poll results are released, they're not subject to disclosure. The Board has an Opinion in

1984 that basically outlines, however, that if the person is a candidate in fact to the fact determination, then the testing of waters exception does not apply.

There's also an issue of federal preemption involved where if the expenditure is by a federal candidate related to a federal office, the application of the FCC is preempted by the FEC's regulations and the Democratic counsel's opinion is, with respect to federal preemption, that the matter is not federally preempted because the poll relates to a state office. And that with respect to the first issue, candidacy, that there was sufficient factual allegations made in the complaint that Elise Stefanik was in fact a candidate for office at the time the poll was disclosed. And so therefore, the requirements for disclosure of the poll are implicated.

And there's at least a fact issue related to candidacy, and so it should proceed to hearing. That is in a nutshell. I will actually, having gone that far, will not attempt to describe the other determination, or proposed determinations. I will just pass it to Kevin to discuss.

Kevin Murphy: I-

Commissioner Berger: You would have a different recommendation?

Kevin Murphy: I would agree with the general framework as described by Brian, but the recommendation of Republican counsel would be that the poll and the disclosure thereof would fall squarely within the reporting exception, the 1984 Opinion regarding testing of the waters polling. And that the candidate as of today was not a candidate as of the time that the poll was taken and fits squarely within that exception as stated in the Opinion.

Brian Quail: So we have a recommendation on how to proceed, if I may. Because there are two recommendations and it creates a bifurcation that's somewhat difficult procedurally. Our recommendation would be to take up the Democratic recommendation. And then if that recommendation fails to secure a majority, it would not be necessary to take up the Republican one because having determined not to go to a hearing, there wouldn't be a need to take up a resolution that says that we should dismiss it. So our recommendation would be that the Board take up the Democratic recommendation.

Commissioner Berger: Oh, we may have to take two votes, but let's at least start with a motion to adopt the Democratic counsel's recommendation.

Commissioner Bagnuola: I move the recommendation by Counsel Quail that this proceed to a hearing.

Commissioner Berger: And I'll second that. We've had discussion. Let's proceed to a vote.

Commissioner Casale: We haven't discussed what?

Commissioner Berger: Oh.

Commissioner Casale: Yeah, I'll have discussion. Yeah, I don't agree, obviously. As far as I'm concerned, the Congresswoman was not a candidate when that poll was released. She became a candidate officially on November 7th when she announced her candidacy and she filed both.... She filed her campaign finance registration and the PCFB registrations on November 7th.

I think it was testing the waters. In this day and age with the news media, anybody can talk about anything. I can say, "I want to run for something." You can talk about it. You can start calling friends. We've got a situation down in Western New York right now where a commissioner is announced that he's going to seek a Senate vacancy, but the vacancy has not occurred yet. The date has not been set, yet he's testing the waters. I would not say that he is required to resign as commissioner right now for the very same reason.

So I think it goes both ways. She was not a candidate back then. She said she was not running for office. She said she might be running for Congress. She made her statements. I don't think she was a candidate, and I don't think it's necessary to go to a hearing because the whole issue is moot at this point anyway.

Commissioner Berger: My understanding of the law is that you don't have to declare you're a candidate or file papers in order to be considered a candidate. This individual was asked in September, specifically, in a broadcast, "Are you running for governor?" And the response was, "Yes, we are."

Commissioner Casale: We. She said, "we."

Commissioner Berger: "Are you running for governor?" "Yes, we are." If she uses a royal we; if she thinks she raises herself to the level of royalty and can use a royal we, it doesn't change. She said, "Yes, we are." She said she was running for office. That was in September. There were indications further in October, similarly. You don't have to be an announced candidate to be ... Under the state of the law, there are opinions. She qualified.

On November 1st, her campaign manager said, "She's not a candidate. She's running for her congressional seat." Five days later, she had a produced video of her announcement for Congress. Clearly that didn't happen on November 6th or November 7th. Clearly, that was in the works. She was running for office well before her filing of papers and her announcement. And it goes back at least 'til September; I think it was the 21st.

So I think under the law, she qualifies as having been a candidate. It's far beyond testing the waters and the FCC, I think, applies to this. That's my position.

Commissioner Casale: So using your logic then, should the commissioner have to resign when he says, "I'm running for Senate."

Commissioner Berger: We have specific regulations for Board employees that set a date when they have to resign. There's a very specific date within our regulations as to when they have to resign. That's not the law that applies under the FCC, under the Fair Campaign Code. Further discussion?

Commissioner Kosinski: I would just say I've carefully considered both memos. I appreciate both counsel preparing the memos for us. I think they were certainly helpful in looking at this. I would just mention one thing about the memo from Brian. You, at least in your analysis claim that, and you say, "As an initial matter, when poll results are released, that act is a suggestive underlying purpose of promo." To bootstrap the idea that the mere release of the poll is now the critical element, which I think really is trying to bootstrap this polling thing in a way that I don't think is appropriate. But I appreciate both, and I am prepared to vote.

Commissioner Berger: Thank you. Anything further discussion? Okay. So the motion on the floor is to approve Brian Quail's recommendation. All those in favor, please indicate.

Commissioners Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. Those opposed?

Commissioner Kosinski: Nay.

Commissioner Casale: Nay.

Commissioner Berger: Not having received the majority, that motion fails. Do the commissioners believe there's a need for a second resolution? Not hearing it, the matter is not going to proceed to a hearing. That's the end of it unless we need anything more formal. I thank both counsel for their work on this. I know it's not an easy one and we thank you.

We now have an Advisory Opinion drafted by Counsels' office related to campaign finance security expenses. This is a companion opinion to the PCFB's, Public Campaign Finance Board, which was adopted during the earlier meeting and important and timely topic in light of the unacceptable political violence that has marked the past few years. Will Counsels' office walk us through the Advisory Opinion?

Brian Quail: Absolutely. So we have fielded a number of telephone calls on these subjects. We've issued the new written Opinions of Counsel, which do not have the gravitas of obviously an Opinion of the Board, which is published, on this subject. This Opinion is very much in keeping with the PCFB Opinion. The analysis here has to do with the application of Election Law 14-130 related to personal use, whereas the PCFB Opinion focused more on those very specific statutory standards related to the use of public funds.

There is a difference in terms of what a campaign can do with public funds, much more constrained, versus what they can do with campaign funds, which are less constrained, but

nonetheless have important restrictions on them in terms of not being allowed to be used for the personal use. They have to be used for purposes that are related to a campaign or the holding of office, whereas public PCFB funds cannot be used for purposes related to the holding of public office.

So there are some differences, thus the need for two Opinions as opposed to just one Opinion that might be adopted by both boards. So there are some slight differences because of the different statutory constructs. Long story short, this Opinion holds that the use of regular campaign funds for purposes of providing security is fine, subject to the normal test of personal use, which is that the expenditures are reasonable under the circumstances for the reasonable purpose and the appropriate purpose for which there.

That is the general standard for all campaign expenses. And this is just making the point fundamentally that the same standard will be held to these types of expenditures in the security realm, which, as you pointed out, Commissioner, have grown in greater significance in recent times.

Commissioner Berger: Unfortunately. Thank you. Is there a motion to adopt the Advisory Opinion?

Commissioner Casale: Yeah, I have a simple question.

Commissioner Berger: Let's take the motion and then we'll go.

Commissioner Casale: So moved.

Commissioner Berger: Second?

Commissioner Bagnuolo: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Okay.

Commissioner Casale: Brian, just to clarify, I don't think the same issue – I raised an issue with the other meeting, over the definition of “security personnel” because the PCFB refers to it as a licensed, professionally trained. That doesn't apply. I don't see it in our ...

Brian Quail: It's not there at all. So the standard for not public funds, but the standard for regular campaign funds-

Commissioner Casale: So it won't be an issue. I just don't want to create an issue where they hire someone who say is a retired police officer and then get stuck with the not being able to reimburse the person.

Brian Quail: Right. There would be no prohibition under this Opinion from using regular campaign funds.

Commissioner Casale: Okay. We're all set. Thank you.

Commissioner Berger: Any further discussion or questions? Hearing none, let us proceed to a vote. All those in favor, please so indicate.

Commissioners Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. That's four votes, so it is unanimous. Is there any other new business? I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Casale: So moved.

Commissioner Berger: With a second-

Commissioner Bagnuola: Second.

Commissioner Berger: Before we proceed to a vote. I'd like to wish everybody happy holidays, a healthy and happy new year. All in favor of adjourning, please so indicate.

Commissioners Kosinski: Aye.

Commissioner Bagnuola: Aye.

Commissioner Casale: Aye.

Commissioner Berger: Aye. It is unanimous. Thank you all.

Commissioner Casale: We agree.

Commissioner Kosinski: Thank you.