CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF CLERKS AND ELECTION OFFICIALS

Legislative Committee Meeting

Minutes – March 8, 2013

Sacramento, California

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attendee | County | Attendee | **County** |
| Stephanie Mizuno | CCAC Legislative Committee | Elma Rosas | Santa Clara |
| Barry Brokaw | CACEO | Austin Erdman | San Joaquin |
| Candy Lopez | Contra Costa | Tricia Webber | Santa Cruz |
| Steve Weir | Contra Costa | Jaime Young | Santa Cruz |
| Karen Rhea | Kern | Bart Broome | Secretary of State |
| Elaine Ginnold | Marin | Jana Lean | Secretary of State |
| Linda Tulett | Monterey | John Gardner | Solano |
| Greg Diaz | Nevada | Gloria Colter | Sonoma |
| Gail Smith | Nevada | William F. Rousseau | Sonoma |
| Alice Jarboe | Sacramento | Donna Linder | Stanislaus |
| Jill LaVine | Sacramento | Aaron Rosa | Stanislaus |
| Deborah Seiler | San Diego (emeritus) | Jessica Stouffer | Stanislaus |
| Michael Vu | San Diego | Joshua Welb | Stanislaus |
| Joe Holland | Santa Barbara |  |  |

Deborah Seiler convened the meeting at 9 a.m. Introductions were made.

**Minutes from February 8, 2013**

Motion by Elma Rosas to approve February 8, 2013 minutes. Gloria Colter seconds motion. Motion carried.

# Legislation

AB 131 (Williams) Voter registration: affidavits; rebuttable presumptions

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would provide that a voter registration affidavit would be deemed complete and valid if the affiant does not provided a place of birth.

Bart Broome from the Secretary of State’s office addressed the bill for Samantha Contreras, Assembly Fellow. Mr. Broome stated that the Secretary of State’s office had reviewed Voting Rights Act consent decrees and memoranda of agreements with counties to determine if the bill would conflict with requirements to collect place of birth information. There does not appear to be a conflict since counties will still be able to collect birthplace information since the birthplace field will remain on the registration form.

Additionally, there was a question raised last meeting if there was a CCROV from the past that might make the bill unnecessary. The CCROV bill that SOS staff located did not address the issue that this bill seeks to address.

Motion to support by Tim McNamara. Elaine Ginnold seconds motion. Motion carries.

AB 269 (Grove) and AB 472 (Patterson) Vote by mail ballots: military or overseas voters

Position: Oppose unless amended

Discussion: These bills would allow the ballots of military or overseas voters to have their ballots counted if they are received no later than 10 days after election day if postmarked by election day. Both bills introduce a notion “timely cast” relating to the return of military/overseas ballots. AB 472 also introduces the idea of the return of military and overseas ballots by facsimile transmission if they are “timely cast”.

Attendees voiced concern about the 10 day extension being excessive in that it will adversely impact the ability to conduct the canvass. Additionally, there is concern that the definition of “timely cast” is unclear within the context of the bills.

CACEO will write “oppose unless amended” letters to suggest acceptance of military/overseas ballots 3 days after the election – instead of 10 days - if postmarked by election day and/or extension of the canvass. The letter will also seek a clarification of the “timely cast” wording and suggest that military/overseas voters be provided the ability to e-mail their ballots.

AB 269: Motion to oppose unless amended by Candy Lopez. Elaine Ginnold seconds motion. Motion carries.

AB 472: Motion to oppose unless amended by Tim McNamara. Alice Jarboe seconds motion. Motion carries.

AB 331 (Garcia) Consolidation of elections

Position: No position

Discussion: This bill would specify that whenever an election called by a district, city, or other political subdivision is consolidated with a county or statewide election, the election shall be conducted according to procedures and practices of the county in which the election is consolidated as determined by the county elections official provided the procedures/practices are consistent with laws regulating the statewide or county election.

Stephanie Mizuno from the City Clerks Association has possible concerns about some of the provisions of this bill. Tim McNamara and Efrain Escobedo from Los Angeles County will meet with Ms. Mizuno to address those concerns.

AB 476 (Jones-Sawyer) Primary election: ballot contents

Position: Watch

Discussion: This is a spot bill related to primary elections.

AB 530 (Quirk-Silva) Vote by mail ballots: telephone applications

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would allow local election officials – at the election official’s option - to offer a voter the ability to apply for a vote by mail voter’s ballot by telephone.

This is a Secretary of State sponsored bill.

Motion to support by Elaine Ginnold. Becky Martinez seconds motion. Motion carries.

AB 642 (Rendon) Publication: newspaper of general circulation: Internet Web site

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would allow provide that a newspaper that is available on an Internet Web site may qualify as a newspaper of general circulation. This bill was provided to attendees for information purposes due to election official’s various publication obligations.

AB 813 (Melendez) Election recounts

Position: Watch

Discussion: This is a spot bill.

AB 817 (Bonta) Election officials

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would authorize an elections official to appoint a person who is a lawful permanent resident of the United States and who is otherwise eligible to vote, except for his/her lack of United States citizenship to serve as a deputy registrar of voters or precinct board member.

Deanna Kitamura from the Asian Pacific American Legal Center (APALC) spoke at the January CACEO meeting and introduced this bill in concept. At that meeting, Ms. Kitamura introduced a bill concept that would (1) allow counties to recruit up to five lawful permanent residents (LPRs) as poll workers per precinct and (2) allow counties to appoint LPRs as deputy registrars.

Ms. Kitamura gave detailed reasons that this bill would be beneficial to election officials related to pollworker recruitment. Generally, they were that Federal and State law require counties to provide language assistance at poll sites when certain racial/ethnic communities reach a threshold number. Experience has shown that recruiting these pollworkers is particularly challenging. The bill concept would potentially open up a large pool of pollworkers to address this challenge since current law limits poll worker opportunities to registered voters (who must be citizens).

Attendees had some concerns related to push back by those who may object to non-citizens handling ballots. Also, it appears that the bill would allow all pollworkers on a precinct board to be LPRs. Some attendees would prefer that at least some citizens staff each poll place.

At that meeting, attendees were interested in following the bill concept as it progresses. Attendees voted to support the concept in general.

At this meeting, Ms. Kitamura presented the concept from January in bill form (AB 817) as described above. Some attendees voiced (or re-voiced) their support of the bill based on provisions in it that would provide an expanded pool of pollworkers in a much needed area (multi-lingual pollworkers) and that – within the bill – there is an ability to appoint LPR pollworkers only at the discretion of local election officials. Other attendees re-voiced their concerns about the bill related to push back by those who may object to non-citizens being placed as pollworkers.

Motion to support by Tim McNamara. Michael Vu seconds motion. Motion carries. (Note: the vote was 10-5 in favor, one vote per county.)

AB 829 (Fong) Election management systems

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would require the vendor of an election management system (EMS) to cause the source code of the EMS to be deposited in an approved escrow facility; require the SOS to adopt regulations implementing this requirement; provide SOS reasonable access to the escrowed materials; and authorize the SOS to seek injunctive relief to implement these requirements.

Motion to support by Autstin Erdman. Greg Diaz seconds motion. Motion carries.

AB 843 (Logue) Voter registration: conditional voter registration and SB 756 (Galgiani) Voter registration

Position: AB 843 Watch/SB 756 Oppose

Discussion: These bills address provisions of AB 1436 from last session. That bill was chaptered and its subject was same day registration/conditional registration which will – upon the implementation of Votecal – allow voters to register and vote up to and on election day at a central location in a county (i.e., the Registrar of Voters office).

AB 843 would require that a conditional registrant provide proof of residency in order for a conditional voter registration to be deemed effective (i.e., count the ballot).

SB 756 would make AB 1436 operative January 1, 2014 instead of being effective upon the implementation of Votecal. Arguments against this proposal were made to the author’s staff at the February 8, 2013 CACEO Legislative meeting. Please see minutes for that meeting for details.

CACEO will form a subcommittee to address the implementation of AB 1436. Joe Holland will chair the committee. Karen Rhea, Michael Vu, Gail Smith, Greg Diaz, Rebecca Martinez, Austin Erdman, and Tim McNamara expressed interest in participating in the subcommittee.

Motion to oppose SB 756 by Austin Erdman. Elaine Ginnold seconds motion. Motion carries.

AB 857 (Fong) Elections: initiative or referendum petitions

Position: Watch

Discussion: This may is a spot bill.

AB 877 (Bocanegra) Direct recording electronic voting systems

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would revise the definition of a “voter verified paper audit trail” – as it relates to a direct recording electronic voting system (DRE) – to instead mean a component of a DRE that prints a synchronous paper record facsimile of each electronic ballot and allows each voter to confirm his or her selections.

This may not be a spot bill.

AB 882 (Gordon) Recall elections: state officers: signature verification

Position: No position.

Discussion: This bill would provide that if 500 or more signatures are submitted to the elections official for a recall petition, the elections official may verify, using a random sampling technique, either 3% of the signatures submitted or 500 signatures, whichever is greater. Current law provides 3% of the signatures submitted or 500, whichever is lesser. This is a SOS sponsored bill.

AB 891 (Jones) Voter registration: requirements

Position: Watch

Discussion: Spot bill.

AB 938 (Weber) Voting: felons: parolees

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would:

* Provide that a person is excluded from voter eligibility if he/she is in state prison or on state parole for the conviction of a felony. This bill would specify that state parole does not include a person on post-release community supervision or mandatory supervision.
* Require, the superior court clerk – when furnishing convicted felon records to county election officials for cancellation – to include only those convicted felons who have been sentenced to state prison and specify in the statement of records that the elections official cancel the affidavit of registration of a person imprisoned or on state parole for a felony conviction whose name, address, and date of birth are the same as reported by the court clerk.

Lori Shellenberger from the ACLU – San Diego – presented the ACLU’s perspective on the bill:

* The bill seeks to clarify and reaffirm existing voting rights; currently there is inconsistent information from the courts to election officials that may be resulting in under-purging or over-purging voter rolls. The second part of the bill addresses this issue.
* The first part of the bill – related to post-release and mandatory supervision - is in the realm of policy and seeks to align the Elections code with other state law related to parolees.

Ms. Shellenberger asked: What do counties need from courts to make the file maintenance process work ideally? Are there amendments that might be helpful to fully realizing the intent of the second part of the bill? Attendees generally thought the bill was going in the right direction but would like to make sure that there is an ability to use SSN or DL numbers in the matching processes and check back with line staff regarding specific processes that might be considered in any amendments. Attendees were clear that it would not be appropriate for CACEO to take a position on the criminal justice policy part of the bill (first part).

Ms. Shellenberger indicated that the SOS is working with the Department of Corrections regarding improving data that they receive in order to do cancellation processes based on unique identifiers (like SSN/DL) and the bill still needs to be amended in relation to the status of federal parolees. So, it is still a work in progress and there is time for CACEO to recommend amendments.

Motion to support by Tim McNamara in relation to the list maintenance portion of the bill but take no position on the criminal justice issue. Jill LaVine seconds motion. Motion carries.

AB 1033 (Donnelly) Corruption of voters

Position: No position

Discussion: Current law makes it a crime for persons or controlled committees to directly or indirectly to pay, lend, or contribute, or offer or promise to pay, lend or contribute, any money or other valuable consideration to or for any voter or for any other person to induce or reward the voter for specified acts, including refraining from voting at any election, voting or refraining from voting at an election for any particular person or measure, and remaining from the polls at an election. This bill would extend this prohibition to political parties as well.

AB 1038 (Pan) Voter registration: paid registration activities

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would prohibit a person from offering to pay or paying money or other valuable consideration to another person, either directly or indirectly, to assist another person to register to vote under a certain political party by receiving the completed affidavit of registration.

AB 1075 (Olsen) Primary elections: voter-nominated offices

Position: No position

Discussion: This bill would provide that a candidate for a voter-nominated office that is a state elective office who receives at least 60% of the votes cast for that office in a primary election that is not a special primary election shall be declared elected to that office.

Attendees took no position.

AB 1117 (Donnelly) Vote by mail ballots

Position: Watch

Discussion: Spot bill.

AB 1122 (Levine) Voter registration: Department of Motor Vehicles

Position: No position

Discussion: This bill has the underlying assumption that the State is not fully compliant with the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA). It would require the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), in coordination with the SOS, to take additional steps to fully comply with the provision of the NVRA. That is, this bill assumes that under the NVRA, a person should not be compelled to complete a separate form when completing DMV forms to register to vote.

Attendees were unclear if this would lead to a completely paperless process when receiving voter registration forms from the DMV.

Bring back for further discussion.

AB 1135 (Mullin) Vote by mail: military or overseas voting

Position: Watch

Discussion: Spot bill.

AB 1157 (Jones) Elections: voting procedures

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would require that DL/California ID/SSN information be placed on vote by mail return envelopes and verified by elections official upon return of a ballot in order for vote by mail ballot to count. It would also allow return of vote by mail ballots from military voters no later than 21 days after the election. It would also require a person who desires to vote, to show specified proof of identification when voting at a poll place.

AB 1170 (Donnelly) Voters: registration cancellation

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would require an elections official to cancel the voter registration of a voter whose name is on the inactive file due to non-response to a residence confirmation mailing.

Will bring back this bill for further discussion. (Jana Lean will review SOS information to see if there may be legal actions from the past, like a consent decree, that may inform the discussion of this bill.)

AB 1311 (Bradford) Voting qualifications

Position: Watch

Discussion: Spot bill.

AB 1316 (Harkey) Election ballots: identical candidate names

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would create a distinguishing mark on a ballot when candidates have identical names and processes surrounding the creation of that distinguishing mark.

Bring back for further discussion.

SB 29 (Correa) Vote by mail ballots and election result statements

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would provide that any vote by mail ballot is timely cast if it is received by the voter’s elections official no later than 3 days after election day and either the ballot is postmarked on or before election day or, if the ballot has no postmark, a postmark with no date, or an illegible postmark, the vote by mail ballot identification envelope is signed and dated on or before election day.

Attendee’s discussion included the following:

* 3 days may problematic given that the US Post Office (USPS) may be going to a five day delivery plan; however, given the state of the USPS the idea of an extension past election day for receipt of ballots seems to have merit.
* Data collected from counties indicates that most late ballots are delivered by the third day after the election; a 3 day extension may be the best extension if one is necessary.
* Some interest in the ability to mail ballots earlier than 29 days before the election or an extension of canvass.
* Concern about voters “gaming” the results in small scale elections by waiting until initial results were tallied/reported before mailing ballots.
* An introduction of the idea of a sunset clause to the author to see what impact the bill has especially in relation to the implementation of same day registration upon the implementation of Votecal.

Motion to support by Jill LaVine and request technical clarifications and possible canvass extension. Karen Rhea seconds motion. Motion carries. (Note: the vote was 10-4 in favor, one abstention, one vote per county.)

SB 44 (Yee) State Internet Web sites: online voter registration

Position: No position

Discussion: This bill would require each website maintained by the state to include a link on the site’s homepage to the SOS online voter registration page.

This is not an SOS sponsored bill and they have no position on it at this time.

SB 112 (Monning) Voter information: public examination

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would require that voter registration card information to available to the public 100 years after the creation of the record. Also, if the records are contained in the great registers of voters and the bound register contains information covering more than one year, the bill would prohibit the public availability of the records until the entire contents of the register have been recorded for at least 100 years. The bill is sponsored by the SOS.

Attendees reviewed this bill at the meeting in February and generally thought this was a good idea but wanted to go back and look at records to determine if there were any unforeseen risks and/or what kind of media in addition to “great register books” may eventually be submitted to the state archive (like microfiche). There were also concerns that 72 years may not be a long enough period since counties have a number of voters who are over 90 years of age. The bill was, subsequently, amended to make registration material available to the public 100 years after the creation of the record.

Motion to support by Tim McNamara. Gloria Colter seconds motion. Motion carries.

SB 213 (Galgiani) Elections petitions: circulators

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would authorize a person to circulate a petition or nominating paper if the person is at least 18 years of age and either a resident of the state or has filed with the SOS an irrevocable consent that suits/actions arising from the petition or nominating paper may be commenced against him/her in any court or competent jurisdiction of California by the service on the SOS of any summons, process or pleadings authorized by law. The bill would require a circulator to certify that he/she is 18 years of age or older and that the circulator has irrevocably consented to suits/actions/service of process, if not a resident of the state.

This is an SOS sponsored bill. It brings California law in line with a federal court decision by allowing a person who does not reside in California to circulate petitions or papers for state or local candidates and ballot measures.

Motion to support by Steve Weir. Tim McNamara seconds motion. Motion carries.

SB 240 (Yee) and SB 267 (Pavley) Polling places: higher education campuses

Position: Watch, send Letter of Concern

Discussion: These bills would, for statewide general elections, require election officials to establish polling places within each California State University, University of California and within each community college if convenient for voters if the county/city has 150,000 voters or more (SB 240) or at least 1,000 people live on campus (SB 247).

CACEO will send a letter to the author based on concerns related to probable confusion by voters of appropriately finding poll places on large campuses, increased numbers of provisional ballots that will not be counted due to lack of student eligibility, and technical problems with re-establishing voting precincts on campus. Instead, the letter would recommend working more closely with campus administrators to educate students about voting locations that already exist on or near campuses and the election process in general.

SB 311 (Padilla) Local elections: charters and charter proposals

Position: No position

Discussion: This bill would allow city or city and county charter actions to be submitted to the voters only at statewide general elections.

Bring back for further discussion.

SB 360 (Padilla) Approval of voting systems

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would allow a county to develop or contract with a vendor to develop a direct recording electronic voting system before the system has received federal qualification provided the system receives qualification prior to any election at which it is first used.

Motion to support by Steve Weir. Austin Erdman seconds motion. Motion carries.

SB 361 (Padilla) Elections: voter registration

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill addresses various voter registration data maintenance including sharing data with other states. Michael Vu and Karen Rhea will research the background of the bill and bring back for further discussion next meeting. This bill appears to be related to a Pew Election Initiative.

SB 362 (Padilla) Voting procedures: natural disasters

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would require the Governor and the SOS to establish voting procedures and guidelines for voters affected by natural disasters. (Note: AB 214 also addresses similar issues.)

Currently the SOS has no position on this bill or AB 214 but generally supports the ideas in the bills.

SB 401 (Rubio) Ballot measure petitions and papers: signatures

Position: Watch, letter of concern

Discussion: This bill would delete the requirement that the voter be unable to personally affix his/her address to a petition in order to request another person to do so. The bill would also require that a person who assists the voter in completing the petition to sign and date the petition below the signature of the voter.

Attendees voiced concerns about at least one court case that may be contrary to the intent of this bill; the desire to have address information affixed to a petition by the voter for administrative and fraud prevention purposes; and concern about petition formatting and related processing challenges.

CACEO will send a letter of concern to the author.

SB 589 (Hill) Vote by mail ballots

Position: Support if amended

Discussion: This bill would require local election officials establish a free access system by which a vote by mail voter may determine whether his/her ballot was counted and, if not, the reason that it was not counted.

Nate Solov, Chief of Staff, Senator Hill’s office, presented the bill to attendees and offered cost saving ideas that might accompany the bill. An example was the exclusion of some sample ballot information in voter information guides provided to voters. (Some counties would not be able to use this option due to the nature of their voting systems.) Attendees requested that Mr. Solov consider a proposal that would allow election officials to use multiple data sources when validating vote-by-mail ballots rather than just the latest signature on file.

Some attendees were concerned that the bill was not necessary since voters were being notified in various forms of vote-by-mail deficiencies before and after canvass and – similar to free the free access system related to provisional ballot status – voters would seldom check vote by mail status after the election. There were also technical concerns raised related to Elections Code section 3019.

There was a request that counties be surveyed regarding ballot rejection rates and cost savings related to exclusion of sample ballot in vote by mail packets and provide information to the author’s office. (Michael Vu reminded attendees that there was significant vote by mail data in the EAC survey that been recently completed by the SOS, so, a survey related to vote by mail rejection may not be necessary.) Attendees were encouraged to think about other cost saving ideas that may be provided to the author in relation to the intent of this bill. First hearing for this bill is not likely to be until early April so there is some time to contribute more information to the author’s office.

Motion to support if amended by Michael Vu. Tim McNamara seconds motion. Motion carries.

SB 637 (Yee) Secretary of State: report: voting prior to election day

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would cause the SOS to conduct a study regarding early voting options and report to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2015, regarding the results of the study.

SB 638 (Lara) Election crimes: misrepresentation by candidates

Position: Watch

Discussion: This bill would make it a misdemeanor for an individual to become or induce another individual to become, a candidate for office under a name that is identical to, or very similar to, another candidate for that same office, with the sole intent of deliberately misleading voters.

SB 654 (Leno and Padilla) Ballot measure petitions: translation

Position: Watch

Discussion: Spot bill.

SB 712 (Lara) Elections: write-in candidates

Position: Support

Discussion: This bill would require that a write-in candidate for a voter-nominated office, in addition to being one of the top two vote-getters, receive votes at the direct primary election equal in number to at least 1% of all votes cast for the office at the last preceding general election at which the office was filled in order for his/her name to be placed on the general election ballot as a candidate for that office.

This bill is similar to AB 141 which we supported.

Tim McNamara will attempt to set up a meeting with members of CACEO and Proposition 14 proponents regarding this bill and AB 141.

Motion to support by Jill LaVine. Gloria Colter seconds motion. Motion carries.

Constitutional Amendments

CACEO does not take positions on Constitutional Amendments but included brief summaries of ACA 7, 9, and 10 and SCA 12 for informational purposes at today’s meeting.

***Petition Subcommittee:*** The Petition Subcommittee received extensive – and very helpful - written feedback from Secretary of State staff. That feedback has been integrated into the draft guidelines. Those updated guidelines were reviewed yesterday. The guidelines should be finalized soon for submission to the CACEO Board of Directors.

***Voters with Specific Needs Subcommittee (VWSN)***

* HAVA 261 funds: SOS issued a CCROV regarding the (likely) final round of HAVA 261 funds. Applications were due 3/8/13 by close of business. Each county is eligible for up to $30,000 if they sent at least one person to training in 2012 or committed to sending someone to training in 2013/14, whenever training dates are finalized. Counties do not need to provide proof of attendance to the 2012 trainings. The SOS once again will do beginner and intermediate levels of training. SOS asked for help setting training dates and the consensus of the VWSN group was that 2-2014 might be a better time to do trainings.

Susan Lapsley with the SOS discussed some of the SOS rationale for 261 funding restrictions. She expressed some concerns regarding the purchase of electronic tablets for conducting Poll Place Accessibility Surveys. She also discussed how to submit applications where the tablets may be a portion of the contract and how contracts can/may be modified only if the items are already part of the contracts. (She recommended two versions of an application should be submitted, one with tablets and one without, so if tablets don't work out, you can still claim the full 30k).

* Jaime Young discussed her meeting with a representative from Robis regarding an electronic tablet and related software that would perform PPAC checklist functions. Ms. Young and Robis plan to continue reviewing the tablet in relation to surveying actual poll places.
* Language service best practice/idea sharing calls will begin in April - First call will focus on questions about the methodology that established which counties get which languages. SOS will host the calls. Tim McNamara will do notices via Elec-Net regarding time/agenda for calls.
* SOS staff to follow up to determine if the language requirements are applicable to cities that run their own elections under 14201 (d).
* Mr. McNamara and Eren Mendezwill solicit assistance for VWSN subcommittee members to 1) review current language glossaries 2) plan for providing language assistance in general to counties. Mr. McNamara and Julia Keh from Los Angeles County will identify appropriate staff in Los Angeles to create glossaries for Hindi, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, and Thai. Note: There are about 300 base terms that should be translated for all languages and some new terms that need to be added will be identified. SOS said they would work with their vendor on reviewing the glossaries once the VWSN subcommittee completes its work.
* Voting Accessible Advisory Committee (VAAC ) assistance: There will be calls similar to the PPAC training calls (in 2011) scheduled in the near future. Mr. McNamara and Ms. Young will lead them. The calls are to assist counties on Voting Accessible Advisory Committee issues - where needed - as well as work on Access Plan s. Ms. Young has created a rough draft of a plan to use as a basis for the VAAC assistance portion of the calls.
* Website Access – the Los Angeles Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk is revamping its website and is seeking assistance in reviewing the site in relation to accessibility. The SOS has been working with the access community to upgrade their site especially in relation to COVR. The UC Technology Initiative is playing a role in the SOS website review. Ms. Young mentioned that Project Civic Access (which is the USDOJ Access enforcement branch) has a simple guide that counties can use as a starter assessment of their sites. The VWSN subcommittee will continue to discuss website access in the future as counties are encouraged to review their websites for accessibility.

***HAVA/Voting System Subcommittee***

Susan Lapsley, Ryan Macias, and Irene Wei of the SOS gave status reports and answered questions on the Statewide Database, Voting Systems, the Voting Modernization Board, etc.

* Voting Modernization Board (VBM): Board Member, Carl Guardino has resigned from the VBM. His seat is a Secretary of State appointment; the other vacancy is a Governor appointment. Three seats have members. There a no meetings scheduled in the near future.
* Irene Wei gave an update on VoteCAL. General Services has approved the VoteCAL contract. The contract will be formalized over the next couple of weeks with finalization targeted for March 18. CGI is the chosen vendor. They are local. They will include DFM and DIMS on their team and both vendors have key roles in the project. The Business Process Committee will be the composed of the same county staff for the prior version of the project with the addition of Butte so far. However, additional counties are welcome. (The commitment will be a number of days per week for several weeks.)
* The first 10 minutes of future HAVA meetings will be opened to a conference call to allow VoteCAL updates to everyone. Attendees requested that representatives from CGI, DIMS, and DFM attend the first meeting in April.
* Susan Lapsley and Ryan Macias reported for OVSTA and other topics.
  + Two systems have voting system applications in to the SOS: 1) Unity 3.4.0.0 which is 2002 VVSG compliant with 2005 modifications, but has one more requirement that will take another month to complete. That requirement relates to ensuring that the use of Chinese characters work properly in the system. 2) Relates to Dominion Democracy Suite 4.14 and is pending. (There is a tentative date of April 15 to begin testing this system.)
  + Dominion withdrew its WinEDS 4.0.175 from EAC testing. This system would have been a natural progression for some California counties. It will not be resubmitted for testing.
  + Three Administrative Approval requests continued to be reviewed for Dominion by OVSTA. They are being bundled together. Two address rank choice voting matters. The third addresses Insight Memory Pack issues.
  + GEMS: The GEMS SSL certificate will expire this November and the certificate for the TSx expires in June. OVSTA staff is working with all vendors who have rights to these products to address the expirations.
  + State ballot printing regulations were up for comment and comments closed on 1/11/13. The Office of Administrative Law has until March 26, 2013 to review the proposed regulations and approve or reject them. There is nothing in the new regulations that should cause cost increases to counties.
  + The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and the EAC held the Future of voting Systems Symposium on Feb 26-28 in Maryland; members of the OVSTA participated in “The Evolving Nature of State Certification” panel. The webcast of the symposium has been archived for viewing on the NIST site.
  + The OVSTA will participate in the Election Verification Network Annual Conference, March 13-15, in Atlanta.
  + For more information on the OVSTA, please see OVTSA Monthly updates that are distributed as CCROV’s. They can also be found on the SOS website.

The meeting was adjourned by Deborah Seiler.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim McNamara

Thank you to Jill LaVine, Jaime Young, and Linda Tulett for their assistance in compiling this month’s minutes.