BEFORE THE FRANKLIN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS

- - -

In Re:

:

Special Meeting.

PROCEEDINGS

before Chairman Douglas J. Preisse, Director William A. Anthony, Jr., Deputy Director Dana Walch, and Board Members Zachary E. Manifold, Bradley K. Sinnott, and Kimberly E. Marinello, at the Franklin County Board of Elections, 280 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, called at 3 p.m. on Monday, March 4, 2013.

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.

222 East Town Street, Second Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
Fax - (614) 224-5724

```
2
 1
      APPEARANCES:
 2
             Franklin County Prosecutor's Office
             By Mr. Harold J. Anderson, III,
 3
             Assistant Prosecuting Attorney
             Civil Division-Environmental
             373 South High Street
             Columbus, Ohio 43215
 5
                  On behalf of the Board.
 6
      ALSO PRESENT:
 7
             Ms. Suzanne Brown,
             Executive Assistant to the Board.
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

		3
1	INDEX	
2		
3	ITEM	PAGE
4	Approval of Board Minutes, 1-25-13 and 2-15-13	4
5	Moving Madison-Plains Local School Issue to Madison County	5
6	Village of Brice Charter Commission	8
7	E.E. Ward Contract Extension	13
8	In-Person Absentee Hours for Primary Election	14
9	Appeal by Selena Miller	17
10	Protests Against Candidacy of Dominic Paretti and Jacqueline Taylor	43
12	Setting Next Meeting Date	47
13	League of Women Voters	52
14	Possible Voter Fraud	65
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

Meeting

4 Monday Afternoon Session, 1 March 4, 2013. 2 3 4 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Good afternoon, 5 everyone. I would like to call the Franklin County 6 Board of Elections meeting to order with the roll call. 8 Kimberly Marinello. MEMBER MARINELLO: Here. 9 10 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Zachary Manifold. MEMBER MANIFOLD: Here. 11 12 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Douglas Preisse. 13 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Here. DIRECTOR ANTHONY: And Brad Sinnott. 14 15 MEMBER SINNOTT: Here. 16 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Mr. Chairman, we are all here and accounted for. 17 18 The first item on the agenda would be the approval of the Board minutes from January 25 and 19 20 February 15. 21 MEMBER SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, I move 2.2 that we approve the minutes of the January 25, 2013, 23 and February 15, 2013, meetings of the Franklin 24 County Board of Elections as submitted.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Second.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor say aye.

I'm passing the signature page for everybody to fill out.

The second item on -- next item on the agenda would be moving the Madison-Plains Local school issue to Madison County. We have Jeff Mackey to talk about that but basically there's a local school levy in Madison County, and some of the voters live here in Franklin County so we've decided it would probably be best for all those voters if we moved them over to the Madison County location.

Jeff.

2.2

2.3

MR. MACKEY: So 3503.01 says, in part, that in any election in which only a part of the electors in a precinct is qualified to vote, which in this case is the Madison-Plains Local School District, the Board may assign voters in such part to an adjoining precinct. Such assignment may be made to an adjoining precinct in another county with the consent and approval of the Board of Elections of such other county if the number of voters assigned to vote in another county is 200 or less.

We had 183 voters in the affected part, split our precinct. I believe Pickaway County also had a small number of voters, and they are also assigning those voters to Madison County so it made sense to us to just assign all of those voters to Madison County so they could run that election for the school district in Madison County.

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: After we -- after we did a little research into this also, the polling location that these voters would be assigned to will actually be closer geographically to them than the precinct they would have here in Franklin County. So from a distance traveled issue, in addition to what Jeff brought up about the legal nature of this, from a convenience factor too we felt this was a wise move for us just to move this over to Madison County.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: And how do we communicate with the 183 voters?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: We will send notices out to each one of those voters to inform them of their — the polling location that they will move to for this election. Then in subsequent elections after that, we would inform them again of being back at the location that they would be at here

in Franklin County.

2.

2.2

2.3

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: And we will also post that at their regular voting location in Franklin County, that the location has been moved to the Madison -- Madison County location.

I must add that there's nothing else on the ballot in Franklin County for them to vote in Franklin County which is why -- another reason to move them to Madison County.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Do we know if these voters will have access to the Madison County voting place by virtue of the Bridges of Madison County?

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So we'll mail them a notice. They will be posted, and we will be ready to field calls on confusion on election day.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: That's correct.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Mr. Chairman, this is something that has routinely be done in the past with similar-type situations, whether it be from one precinct to another precinct within the county or, as Jeff explained earlier, from one precinct within one county to another county. This is something that is routinely done.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay.

MEMBER MARINELLO: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board temporarily re-assign the 183 Franklin County voters in Madison-Plains Local School District to the Fairfield South location in Madison County located at 910 Big Plain Circleville Road to vote in the May 7 Primary Election in the Madison-Plains School District for this election only.

2.2

2.3

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Is there a second?

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Second.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor say aye. Opposed same sign. The motion carries.

The next item on the agenda is the Village of Brice Charter Commission.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Jeff, can you fill the members of the Board in on what took place here.

MR. MACKEY: The Village of Brice intends to -- the Village of Brice intends to ask their voters if they would like to establish a Charter Commission for the Village of Brice. The Charter Commission question would be on the ballot along with members of the Charter Commission. They have to elected 15 people to serve on the Charter Commission. Should the question pass and those 15 people are

elected, then those 15 people would put together a charter for the Village of Brice for the Village voters to vote on in a subsequent election and then there would be a charter village instead of a statutory village, if that helps.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: That helps.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: We did -- just so you know the full story on this, they filed this document timely. We did go back to the Village of Brice and ask them to -- if they would consider, upon discussion with counsel on this, if Brice would go back and amend the resolution that they passed as the original document that they passed called for a 45 days before the election filing deadline which obviously conflicts with our ability to get out overseas military ballots which is 45 days prior to the election.

So we communicated with the Village of Brice and asked if they would amend their original resolution, which they did, and they set a 60-day filing deadline for this Charter Review Commission which then buys us enough time to administratively get -- to meet our federal responsibility if there are any overseas military or civilian ballots that

need to go to voters in the Village of Brice.

2.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Sounds good.

MEMBER SINNOTT: I move that the Board place on the May 7 Primary Election ballot the Charter Commission question timely filed by the Village of Brice.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Is there a second?

MEMBER MARINELLO: Second.

agenda is the renewal of our EMCS contract. EMCS is Election Management Consulting Services, and they are the company that does our voter registration system. And I was just instructed this is a new contract, and I have it here. We've been working — they are the sole source provider for our voter registration system that we use. We are the only ones in the state of Ohio that use this system. This system has worked very well for us. We've managed to make it as I like to refer to the Cadillac or Rolls Royce of voter registration systems in the state of Ohio.

Through Carolyn Gorup's effort and her team, we have been able to get this system to do things that are the envy of other counties. So we need to get the contract -- I keep saying extended,

but it's a new one so -- and Carolyn is here if you need some discussion more about the system and all the great stuff we are able to do with our voter registration system.

2.2

2.3

MEMBER SINNOTT: And, Bill or Harold, this is a no bid contract, correct?

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: That's correct. This is the sole source provider for us.

MEMBER SINNOTT: There is only one perspective provider?

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: That's it.

MR. ANDERSON: It's a proprietary

software that they apparently worked on when they were part of Sequoia or the company that produces the Sequoia software. They have subsequently left.

Sequoia doesn't support the software internally any more, and to our knowledge they are the only two people that are equipped to be able to work with that particular iteration of the software.

MEMBER SINNOTT: And that's the reason why it's proper for us to let the contract in the absence of bidding.

MR. ANDERSON: And also it's below the statutory threshold in the Revised Code for public

bidding.

2.2

2.3

2 MEMBER SINNOTT: Thank you.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Carol, did you want to add anything to the discussion? I know I didn't ask you earlier.

MS. GORUP: I really don't have anything to add. You might need a new department, if you don't.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Well, you sold me with that Carol. I can't afford to lose you.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: And the only signature on it, this contract, would be yours, Mr. Chairman, so I will pass it down, two copies for you to sign.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I am not going to sign them until we vote.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Well, after we vote, sir. Motion.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Mr. Chairman, this
Board finds that the Election Management Consulting
Services is the only company able to provide
consulting services on the Board's Sequoia Voting
System and, therefore, move that the Board authorize
the Board Chairman to execute a contract with
Election Management Consulting Services in the amount

of \$46,305 for continued support on the Integrity system in calendar year 2013.

1

2.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Is there a second?

MEMBER MARINELLO: Second.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor aye. The motion carries, Mr. Chairman.

The next item on the agenda is — this is an extension of our contract with E.E. Ward Moving & Storage Company, LLC. They are the company that we've contracted with for a number of years to move all our voting equipment to all the various voting locations and then pick it up and bring it back to us. And this is the second —

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: I think it's the third of four possible extensions.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Thank you. This is the third of four extensions for this contract.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: And we have been pleased with their service for many years; is that not correct?

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: And that is correct.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board extend the contract of E.E. Ward Moving & Storage Company, LLC, through April 5, 2014,

for the transportation of voting machines.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Is there a second?

MEMBER MARINELLO: Second.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor say

aye.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

And then Kim has the contract document.

Again, there's two copies and we have to sign it.

The next item on the agenda is we have to set in-person absentee hours for the primary election. We are proposing the following, and this is from the -- our employees here, that hours be from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday beginning April 2, 2013, ending May 3, 2013, and be open Saturday, May 4, 2013, from 8 until noon, and all the voting will be conducted here at Memorial Hall.

And, again, this is an off-year election. We don't expect a huge turnout at all. And if you need, we have Todd here, our absentee department, if you have any questions about the hours.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Do you want to tell us how you arrived at the hours or?

MR. WEDEKIND: Typically this type of election we would do 8 to 5 Monday through Friday, the last Saturday 8 to noon. That's in line with

what we have done in the past for primary/special elections.

2.2

2.3

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: And this doesn't -the Secretary of State setting the hours was just for
the Presidential cycle. We set our hours for these
type of things.

in-person absentee would be consistent with what the hours are for mayoral absentee which would shut off at noon on Saturday, the Saturday before the election. We will have staff in the office that Saturday morning to get out the last minute absentees via mail anyway so that's why it seemed to make sense to us and, as Todd said, is consistent with past practices by the Board to put those hours in there also that final Saturday.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Did we do a prediction of turnout for the municipal primary?

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: We try not to do the projection of turnout because that's -- we just try not to do it. We let you know what happened after.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Typically you can't -you can't predict with any accuracy, but you can
explain the hell out of it after it happens.

```
1
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: That's right.
2
                  MR. WEDEKIND: I can tell you in 2011,
3
     which was similar to this election, we had 3 -- about
4
     3,000 mailed absentee ballots and 163 in-person
5
     voters so I expect it to be similar to that.
6
                  MEMBER MANIFOLD: There wasn't a city
7
     primary, right?
8
                  MR. WEDEKIND: Yes.
9
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Yes, there was a
10
     primary. There was.
11
                  MEMBER SINNOTT: In 2011?
12
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Yes, sir.
13
                  MR. WEDEKIND: Yes.
14
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: There was a primary
15
     and we had seven or eight -- seven or eight folks on
16
     the ballot and we narrowed it down to six or whatever
17
     it was.
18
                  MR. WEDEKIND: If you remember, we had
     like seven write-in candidates for the school board
19
     race.
20
21
                  DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: The other issue
2.2
     with predicting municipal turnout elections you are
23
     not always comparing apples to apples because you
24
     never know who is going to have something on the
```

ballot in a primary and who doesn't. What might have been in the ballot of 2011, you know, we do have some communities this primary that do have nothing. Grove City, for example, doesn't have anything on the ballot, so when you get into that, it starts to get into not an apples to apples type comparison because some municipalities may not have anything on the ballot.

2.3

aye.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Trust me, everyone who is registered to vote we want to come out and vote. We don't want to set the parameters out. We want them to all show up and vote.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Board set early voting hours -- in-person absentee voting hours for 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday beginning April 2, 2013, and ending May 3, 2013, and Saturday, May 4, 2013, from 8 a.m. to noon at Memorial Hall, 280 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Second.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor

The next item on the agenda is the appeal by Selina Miller. I will let Jeff go through that,

and Ms. Miller is here to give testimony.

2.2

2.3

MR. MACKEY: I'll let Ms. Miller walk through her appeal, but I have attempted from some of the information she has provided us already to give you a document that will enable you to follow along. The first two pages that you have here were filed previously and that is what appears in my document at the end. The third page is something that she brought in today so we would —

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: This is one --

MR. MACKEY: So we may have some additional people for us to look at which is why I have set the laptop up here so I may have to have you slide out of the way.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay. Why don't you give a few -- are you coming back over here to do that?

MR. MACKEY: Maybe in a second.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Why don't you give -to put in context for us, a fresh -- and for the
record and our audience today, why don't you put this
in context, a minute or so of narrative.

MR. MACKEY: Originally upon reviewing her petition the Board decided that she had 296 valid

signatures of the 300 necessary for her to be a certified candidate. The Board elected not to certify her election to the ballot for this primary election.

MEMBER SINNOTT: You said 297?

MR. MACKEY: 296.

MEMBER SINNOTT: So that's four short,

correct?

2.2

2.3

MR. MACKEY: Correct. Actually let me double-check that.

I think it's actually 294. She needed six signatures. Sorry about that. So she has put together — she went through some of the petitions and looked at some of the ones that we did not allow and has provided some additional information on why we should have allowed certain signatures that might, in fact, put her over the top.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I'm trying to make sense of where -- okay. Now, describe the documents you've given us then. The top one which is --

MR. MACKEY: So the document I have put together would go along with her appeal letter there. The first one is -- the first person she had questioned was Henry Scott. I listed Mr. Scott as

```
petition No. 662, line No. 10. With his address
1
     there, the first kind of image there is --
3
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I don't know that any
4
     of us were following what you were looking at --
5
                  MR. MACKEY: Okay.
6
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: -- at the moment.
7
                  MR. MACKEY: This document at the top
8
     says Selina, candidate for Columbus Board of
9
     Education, appeal research.
10
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay.
11
                  MEMBER SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, if I may,
12
     so, Jeff, what you have done is you have given us
13
     comparative signatures on the signers ascribed in
14
     Ms. Miller's February 19 challenge to the Board's
15
     initial decision, correct?
16
                  MR. MACKEY: That's correct.
                  MEMBER SINNOTT: And then Ms. Miller has
17
18
     an additional 10 signatures that she would like for
     us to examine described in her March 4 filing,
19
20
     correct?
21
                  MR. MACKEY: I'm not sure how many of
2.2
     those are new. Actually I would have to look at it.
                  MEMBER SINNOTT: Would it be correct to
2.3
24
     say any that are new, you don't have prepared for our
```

comparison?

2.2

MR. MACKEY: That is correct. So we can look at those on the computer here, if we need to.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Then there is the appeal filed the 19th and then there is an -- is this an amended one on the 21st, add these down here to the bottom? Is that what --

MR. MACKEY: Right, yeah.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Okay.

MR. MACKEY: Those would -- are in my documentation because they came in last week.

MEMBER SINNOTT: So there would be some number of signatures now in question where we're not prepared to do comparison right now.

MR. MACKEY: Well, I set up the computer so we can do that, should you choose.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: But he does not have copies of them like he does for the initial ones that were filed, if that's the question you are asking.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Is the sole issue
whether we believe as a Board the signature on the
petition matches the signature on the Board's record?

MR. MACKEY: Yes. The question for the

2.2

Board will be whether or not that signature on that petition should be accepted as a valid signature even though we had originally invalidated it.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: And that statement you just made pertains to 1 to 9 on the February 21 document with the handwriting at the bottom or no?

MR. MACKEY: Yes.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Is the February 21 document with the handwriting at the bottom sufficient to look at because it includes everything that was on this February 19 1 to 7?

MR. MACKEY: Yeah. The February 21 document, the copy of the one that was filed on the 19th with the addition of those two extra names.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So we can put this document aside and not be deficient in questions -- signatures in question?

MR. MACKEY: Yes, you can set aside the February 19 filing and look only at the February 21 filing.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Match that to this document here that actually shows the breakdown of the signatures.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: And what is this

Armstrong & Okey, Inc., Columbus, Ohio (614) 224-9481

2.3

document which appears to be the same one without handwriting but --

MR. MACKEY: Right. She has again brought that with her today.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Oh, this is what Ms. Miller brought today.

MR. MACKEY: So I think some of those are just cleaned up, the ones that were on here before.

I'm not certain. I didn't get a chance to look at it.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Well, because of the importance of the matter and the premium I think we ought to place on getting this right, I'm certainly inclined to consider what Ms. Miller has presented to us on the 4th of March.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Yeah, absolutely. I am just trying to sort out what we are looking at so we can proceed clearly and logically.

MEMBER SINNOTT: But it's unclear to me, because I don't think we have done it before, whether we are prepared to use the computer screen as to sort through the issues new as of today but I'm game.

MR. MACKEY: We'll give it a shot.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Okay.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Yeah. That's fine, although we wouldn't begin there. We would begin with the No. 1.

MR. MACKEY: That would be my recommendation.

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Correct.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: All right. Do you want to walk us through then?

MR. MACKEY: Do you want me to walk you through, or do you want to hear from Ms. Miller and then I can help you with what I have put together? I don't know.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay. I'm not sure it matters. So why don't -- you have been standing patiently by so why don't we proceed with you, and I think our stenographer will ask you to state your name for the record.

MS. MILLER: My name is Selina Miller, filed a petition under Selina Renee Miller. Good afternoon. As stated before, there was an original appeal request indicated or submitted, and at that time I had several names. Some were omitted eventually because I did a computer scan of my own. Now, what I did come up with is the first page for

Mr. Mackey, it has a copy of the name that was submitted. I guess it was omitted as a deficiency because they had a name as Hay, H-A-Y; and in actuality the name is Henry. In my new appeal that I filed today requests -- in documentation it shows on the first page that I submitted on a day prior to the deadline and that's which -- that's marked for March 4 a voter's registration form showing that he did indicate his name is Henry Scott.

2.2

MR. MACKEY: And we put it in as Henry Scott. Somebody who was checking the petition had difficulty reading the original signature so if -- on my document there you'll see under the petition line --

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Make that clear again.

MR. MACKEY: If you'll look at the one
that's headed Miller, Selina, candidate for Columbus
Board of Education, so we are on the first page here.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Right.

MR. MACKEY: First line there is just me identifying what petition it was, what line it was.

I've also cropped out the actual signature line of that petition so you can see that someone might have

a little difficulty reading that. We coded it as Hay

Scott and not registered because we couldn't find anybody by that name.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: The address checks out?

MR. MACKEY: Yes. Through Ms. Miller's research she was able to identify him as Henry Scott. And as you can see on his little registration card, the address was similar so we can take a moment there to see if you feel that signature is valid.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: How do we wish to proceed, on a case-by-case, signature-by-signature basis?

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: And you should look at -- what you should be looking at is signature on file which would be the application at the bottom of the document that Jeff put together, and then the snapshot of that line item on the petition, how that person signed the name on the petition. You have to compare that with the signature on file, and if you think that there is enough similarity in the signatures, then it would be a match. If you don't think there is enough similarity in the signatures, then it's as is. It doesn't count.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think

this might be more time efficient if we hear fully from Ms. Miller now and then turn to a case-by-case consideration by the Board of each signature comparison after that.

2.2

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: That sounds like a good idea.

MS. MILLER: So you want me --

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Yes, please. Why don't you give us your whole report.

MS. MILLER: Okay. Well, as stated on the appeal research and my voter's registration form, the signatures are all the same so I counted that as a one that was not counted. It is the same signature.

Okay. And on the paper that was submitted by Mr. Mackey in regards to Leah Stephens, it says it's not registered. I omitted that one from my count. I believe he said that was not -- I'll keep that up to you. I don't know how he counted that one. Did you --

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Jeff, are we referring now to the $-\!-\!$ I wish we had a better way to refer to this No. 2 $-\!-\!$

 ${\tt MS.}$ MILLER: He has his appeal search and

mine just says appeal at the top so on his second page of his appeal search it says Leah Stephens and I don't know -- it was not a registered address is what he is saying so.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Jeff, jump in here and clarify.

MR. MACKEY: I think Nos. 2, 3, and 4 on her latest letter were not on the original letter; is that correct, Selina? Nos. 2, 3, and 4 on your new filing, were they on the original?

MS. MILLER: 2, 3, and 4, no.

MR. MACKEY: Those are new?

MS. MILLER: Those are new ones, yeah.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay. It is not clear to me what we are talking about. I am going to rely on you now to look at point No. 2, the Leah Stephens' signature. The question is why is that on this page? And put in context what we are talking about as it relates to that signature.

MR. MACKEY: Line No. 2 was on petition 681, Leah Stephens. I have the first clip there is the signature line of the petition. This is page 2 of my documents.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Oh, okay, right.

Armstrong & Okey, Inc., Columbus, Ohio (614) 224-9481

MR. MACKEY: She's following along with what I gave her that you have so we can all be on the same.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay.

2.2

2.3

MR. MACKEY: So she was talking about that one. And we coded that as not registered there you can see.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Because?

MR. MACKEY: She pointed out this person was, in fact, registered. I was able to find her.

Once we get to the end I will point out that this person is actually out of the district even though she did sign the petition so we are not going to be able to count this one anyway.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay, okay.

MR. MACKEY: But I was able to find out she was registered. She should not have been registered at that address but will eventually be coded as out of the district.

MEMBER SINNOTT: In the estimation of staff Ms. Stephens is not eligible because she is not an elector in the school district?

MR. MACKEY: Correct. She is in the Groveport Madison School District.

```
1
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay. Next.
2
                  MS. MILLER: On the third page of
3
     Mr. Mackey's for the petition 682, line 13, for Karla
4
     Lipscomb.
5
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: What about Steven
6
     Taylor?
7
                  MR. MACKEY: Steven Taylor was already
8
     counted as a valid signature in our system, so on the
     petition it looked like possibly it wasn't counted
9
10
     but it was.
11
                  MEMBER SINNOTT: So he is among the 294.
12
                  MR. MACKEY: Correct.
13
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Why is he -- okay.
     I'm sorry to interrupt you. Karla Lipscomb.
14
15
                  MS. MILLER: Karla Lipscomb, she was
16
     originally indicated I believe a nonregistered
17
     person, and I had a voter's registration form that
18
     was submitted on 2-5-2013 and it's among the ones
     that I submitted today. There's a voter's
19
20
     registration form.
21
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So there's a line on
2.2
     the petition and this is the registration form.
                  MEMBER SINNOTT: What was the staff's
2.3
24
     reason for opposing this allowance?
```

MR. MACKEY: Whoever was looking up this particular one was not able to find them. However, Ms. Miller was able to tell us that it was Karla Lipscomb, so when I look up Karla Lipscomb and pull up her registration form, I can see that that is an actual registered person at 4857 Kingshill. The 7 kind of blends into the Kingshill. Maybe the person wasn't able to find it because of that.

2.2

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I can also certainly understand how the signature on the petition would be very difficult to read. Having said that it pretty closely matches this -- the same illegible signature on the registration card.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Was she registered to vote at the time she signed the petition?

MS. MILLER: Yes, sir. You have a voter registration form.

MR. MACKEY: You are looking at a registration form. There on the right-hand side you will see that came in on the 4th of February.

MEMBER SINNOTT: So she became registered the 4th. It appears as though she signed the petition on the 3rd.

MR. MACKEY: As long as the person is

registered at the time that we are checking the petition, that is the guiding principle there so typically candidates will bring lots of registrations in with them as Ms. Miller did and file them with their petitions.

2.2

2.3

MEMBER SINNOTT: So it has been the practice of the Board to ignore when the petition was signed but rather to look only to whether the person signing was registered by the time the Board's staff is doing the review.

MR. MACKEY: Actually I think it's at the time the petition was filed.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Yes.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: You can see from hers she did sign it on 2-3, her voter registration form, which is also the day she signed the petition. So she would have signed the petition and the voter registration form on the same day which is --

MEMBER MANIFOLD: It looks like we have a record of receiving it on the 4th which the deadline was the 6th?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: 6th.

MEMBER SINNOTT: I wasn't hearing any objection to the legal discussion.

1 MR. ANDERSON: No. There is actually case law on point from the Ohio Supreme Court as long 2 3 as the registration is received prior to the petition 4 being filed, it's a valid registered electoral vote. 5 MEMBER MANIFOLD: Should we come back and vote on each one of these? 6 7 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. You need to go 8 through each one individually. 9 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay. 10 MS. MILLER: And, next, we have three 11 signatures which were challenged for being printed is 12 what I was told. And I pulled them up, and I can see 13 the connecting letters for each one so I counted them as cursive for Alfonzo Woodford, Eric Jenkins, and 14 15 Ashlie Depinet. 16 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay. Let's proceed 17 to 8. 18 MS. MILLER: Okay. And there's a Lisa Shepherd and I could tell her signature to be the 19 20 same. 21 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: What happened to 2.2 Herbert Safford?

MR. MACKEY: Mr. Safford was already a

2.3

24

valid signature.

1 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay. I'm sorry. 2 Please continue. MS. MILLER: Yes. Lisa Shepherd next on 3 4 your? Okay. Lisa Shepherd is showing the same 5 signature as what I'm showing that was in the same 6 system -- in the system. 7 MR. MACKEY: On this one I actually 8 messed it up because I went back, as you can see from my little checkmark there, and found it but did not 9 10 get it corrected in the system so. 11 MEMBER SINNOTT: Lisa Shepherd in the 12 294? MR. MACKEY: She is not in the 294. 13 14 MEMBER SINNOTT: And there's no dispute 15 now about the correctness. 16 MR. MACKEY: If you are asking my 17 opinion, then, yes, that one should have been 18 counted. 19 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay. 20 MS. MILLER: And going back to my one 21 that I submitted today, there were three new ones, if you take a look there on the one marked March 4. 2.2 2.3 MEMBER MANIFOLD: I have a quick 24 question, so the deadline for the appeal protest is

February 22, right? Can you -- you can continue to amend all the way up until today?

2.2

MR. MACKEY: Actually there is no deadline for appeals. Only protests have a deadline.

MS. MILLER: And in addition to that, I was told I just had to submit the letter, but I was trying to give Mr. Mackey some idea of what I was trying to appeal.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Oh, okay.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Thanks. I just wanted to make sure.

MS. MILLER: And on the new one dated for today, I found new ones, and it notes 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. The No. 1 we went over for Henry Scott so if you go to No. 2, I could start over again for you.

O0663, line No. 11 it shows on the response DJ.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay. I need to catch up. These are the ones you have to pull up electronically?

MR. MACKEY: Do you want me to start?

MR. ANDERSON: While Jeff is doing that it may be helpful to go through the original filings to see these last three, potentially may not matter if she didn't get enough valid signatures in the

```
original couple in the original.
```

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: You are saying we are at 294, Jeff. Even because you —— the two we have just reviewed or three that we have forwarded to the staff in agreement, they are okay?

MR. MACKEY: Right, so she would need all six of the remaining ones on her second filing.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Well, I think there's two, right, that aren't in there that I think --

MR. MACKEY: She filed nine. I've got three. Two of them were -- I'm sorry, you're correct. Two were already valid, and one was out of district so we won't be able to count.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: That's right, valid signature, not valid on this particular so that -- okay. So that -- does that take us to 6 in question and she's at 294?

MR. MACKEY: Correct.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So if all of these -- Harold's point is for it to be okay, she would hit 300.

MR. MACKEY: Yep.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: What's your thought on

24 that?

```
1
                  MEMBER SINNOTT: My suggestion is that we
     go ahead and complete the exercise of looking at the
2
3
     signatures for comparison, and I'm not sure how we
4
     are going to come out.
5
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: All right. Let's look
6
     at the next one. What is it?
7
                  MR. MACKEY: Three.
8
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Three.
                  MS. MILLER: Actually four, I believe it
9
10
     is.
11
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So we are now looking
     at -- you're pulling up her petition; is that right?
12
13
                  MR. MACKEY: Yep. She is talking about
     line 11 of petition 663 so here is line 663, here is
14
     line 11.
15
16
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Now, where are we
17
     looking at? Registration cards?
18
                  MR. MACKEY: I'll have to pull those up
     also.
19
20
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: You have to pull those
21
     up?
2.2
                 MR. MACKEY: Yep.
23
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Are you able to do
     that in the same?
24
```

MEMBER SINNOTT: Jeff, are we really 1 going to have to do a comparison on the same screen? 2 3 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Line 11 is what name? 4 MS. MILLER: Actually it says 00663, line 5 11 says DJ. That's my response from you all. But 6 when I look on the signature petition, it says John Like, and it has nothing to do with the initials that 8 was omitted, DJ. MR. MACKEY: She is referring to the 9 10 report that we gave her that said line by line how we coded each line on the petition. So whoever is 11 12 searching used initials to search and probably an 13 address. But, yeah, my question would be who do you contend it is that we were not able to find? 14 MS. MILLER: You said you could not find 15 16 DJ, DJ. You have a signature from a person named I believe it's John Like which it would be JL. 17 18 MR. MACKEY: How do you spell Like? 19 MS. MILLER: I think it's L-I-K-E or 20 something, I'm not sure. But it has DJ for your 21 reason of not counting it in, so my theory of it is 22 it was miscounted simply because it has no bearing of 23 what you're saying, DJ versus JL.

Then the No. 12 is the same way. It says

24

WS and the person's name is Sarah White. Then I got confused because unlike Sarah White is SW, this person has WS. And then it goes MA, and then the name is Ashley Met.

2.2

MEMBER MARINELLO: They just have the initials wrong here, last name first.

MR. MACKEY: That's how we search.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So the question line
No. 11, this petition which appears to be John Like,
L-I-K, or something similar, Ms. Miller is saying why
didn't we count that; is that right? And our coding
says not registered.

MR. MACKEY: Not registered at the address.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So the question is can we here in realtime find it or not? We were unable -- staff was unable to find it previous to today. If we can't -- do you know this person?

MS. MILLER: I was just in a flow in a city.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So you don't know what the name is?

MS. MILLER: Not personally other than what they wrote down.

1 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Is the address 2 legible? Can you pull it up by address? 3 MS. BROWN: Search for a John, 3522. 4 MR. MACKEY: It's frozen. 5 MEMBER MARINELLO: Been there, done that. 6 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I think, Board 7 Members, staff, I was about to come to the same 8 conclusion that Bradley suggested. Given, Mr. Sinnott, we want to get this right as obviously 9 you do and we are having technical difficulty with 10 the computer seizing up, I would like to give my 11 12 colleagues permission that the staff go back and try 13 to bring as much clarity to these matters as you can 14 and reduce the pieces of paper down to the extent we 15 can in the comparison of signatures and registration 16 cards for the petition and the registration cards and 17 present this in as logical and clear a manner as we 18 can probably in communication with Ms. Miller. 19 Some of this information we just got 20 together. We want to get it right. It appears 21 because of other issues on the agenda we have to have -- we would like to have another Board meeting 2.2 2.3 in the pretty near future, so hopefully we can proceed along those lines. How does that sound to 24

everybody?

2.2

2.3

MEMBER MARINELLO: I agree.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Yeah. That's fine.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Chairman, I think one of the goals here is to create a written exhibit to the transcript of the Board meeting when we make the decision on Ms. Miller's case, that somebody in reviewing the exhibits would know what it is that was the basis for the Board's action to compare the signatures. I don't think there would be any harm at all in communication between Ms. Miller and staff about the clarification of the exact issue that comes before us as to each signature in question.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I think that will provide us with greater clarity and Ms. Miller in the process. That thing, is it still seized up?

MR. MACKEY: It's running, just slow.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I think we should proceed as discussed on this matter. Thanks for coming in and --

MS. MILLER: I do want to make one more statement. I just want to keep in mind all of these are not in comparison to the signature. It's the way -- like I said, No. 1 through 7, No. 2 through 4

where it says, you know, the initials and the names are not matching, like you said earlier, how can you omit it from a count if the name is not even matching up? And then another one was for the Bill Watkins. He is a neighbor so I indicated that one, and Karla Lipscomb, I want to reiterate her name is signed the same way on the voter registration form.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay. We got a good look at some of those including the Lipscomb situation, but I think we need to put them all apples to apples in as clear a fashion as we can create with your cooperation. I appreciate you coming in today.

MS. MILLER: No problem.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Thank you.

MS. MILLER: Thank you.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: So we will notify her of our next meeting.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ ANDERSON: We need a motion to table this matter.

MEMBER SINNOTT: So moved. Mr. Chairman, motion to table the Selina Miller appeal until the time of the next Board meeting.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Second.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor say

aye.

2.2

2.3

The next item on the agenda would be the protest against the candidacy of Dominic Paretti. We have an individual that filed a protest there was signatures that should not have been counted. Jeff, do you want to walk us through those? Is Ms. Reis here?

MR. MACKEY: So is it Reis?

MS. REIS: Reis.

MR. MACKEY: Ms. Reis filed the protest originally on February 22. In addition we received an addendum to that this morning. Those are both there. The document I have prepared includes all of those as well as actually my -- my document does include some information that Mr. Paretti was going to present, but he has withdrawn his appeal of some of our signatures that he thought we should have counted. So those groups are all in the same document that you have there.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So we have two letters from Ms. Reis dated February 22 and March 1 detailing various signatures that question her findings. And then what are these two? Describe these two

```
44
 1
     comparatives.
                  MR. MACKEY: Right. One is for the next
 2
 3
      issue which is Jacqueline Taylor so set that aside
 4
     for a moment.
 5
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay. And this
 6
     document that you have given us here which begins
 7
     with petition 1455, line 15, Miller, Marco.
                  MR. MACKEY: Yes. That should follow
 8
     along with the items she brought forth in her protest
 9
10
     letter.
11
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: In her protest letter
12
     or letters?
13
                  MR. MACKEY: Letters.
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So both of these
14
15
     protest letters match this.
16
                  MR. MACKEY: That is correct.
                  MEMBER MANIFOLD: Do we have the ones
17
18
     from today ready?
19
                  MR. MACKEY: Yes.
20
                  MEMBER MANIFOLD: The ones from this
21
     morning.
```

it was captioned, right?

March 1 appeal of protest. At least that was the way

MEMBER SINNOTT: Here Mr. Paretti filed a

2.2

23

24

MR. MACKEY: Yes.

2.2

2.3

MEMBER SINNOTT: So he -- he has had an opportunity to respond to the February 22 collection of questions, but I presume he has had no opportunity to respond to the March 4 collection of questions.

MR. MACKEY: That would be -- he has not responded. I don't know that he -- he was alerted earlier today that we received that. The items that he appealed were not necessarily items brought up in the letter but were additional signatures more along the lines of Ms. Miller's appeal that he found that we felt we should have counted that we had invalidated.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: I think the question you are asking, Mr. Sinnott, is has he had a substantial amount of time to even consider the amended — or the amended portion of this, and the answer to that is no since it just was filed today. He did not have, you know — yes, he was notified that we got it, as was Ms. Taylor on her petition also. Being that they were just filed today, they have had since this morning to know about this.

MEMBER SINNOTT: My inclination we want to consider all relevant evidence and get this right,

but I want to afford Mr. Paretti and perhaps
Ms. Taylor too, I haven't seen her material yet, the
opportunity to address everything that's being called
in question. It seems to me a matter of fundamental
fairness.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Yeah. Just brief the situation, material as late as today was submitted. This is — this is the case again. So I think we should give ourselves and the candidates in question a chance to get it right. And, Brad, you're suggesting handling the case, this situation, all together and not pick apart a part of it today and more of it later.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Yeah. That would be right. Why don't we give Mr. Paretti an opportunity to be heard on all the evidence and Ms. Taylor whose similarly situated. I think we need to afford her the same opportunity. We've already decided we have to meet again soon to consider Ms. Miller's matter so it would seem to make sense for me for these three questions about whose qualifying for the school board primary to come before the Board in the near term but at a date other than this one.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I think that makes a

```
lot of good sense.
1
                  MEMBER MANIFOLD: I agree.
3
                  MEMBER SINNOTT: If everyone agrees,
4
     Mr. Chairman, I move we table the Paretti and Taylor
5
     matters until such time as the Board next meets.
6
                  MEMBER MANIFOLD: Second.
7
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor say
8
     aye. Motion carries.
                  The next item on the agenda would be
9
10
     maybe we should set that date for the next meeting so
11
     that everyone here will know when that next meeting
12
     date is. Everybody like to get their calendars out
     and let us know when is a good time?
13
                  MR. ANDERSON: You are running up against
14
15
     statutory -- deadlines for statutory.
16
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Next week?
17
                  MR. ANDERSON: Next week is probably as
18
     late as you can do it.
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: What is your deadline?
19
20
                  MR. ANDERSON: 23rd.
21
                  DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Todd, what's the
2.2
     date?
                 MR. WEDEKIND: We have to mail on the 2nd
2.3
     which is a Saturday so we don't want to be anywhere
24
```

```
1 near that date.
```

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.3

24

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: So this week would be good or first of next week?

4 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: How does Tuesday,

5 | March 12, in the afternoon look?

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: That would give us 10 days. Would that be enough time to copy?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: It's the 23rd, Saturday, the 23rd.

MR. WEDEKIND: I'm sorry, Jeff. Last weekday is the 22nd but that doesn't give Karla much time. I would recommend doing it this week so we have time -- we still have to create all the bases -- approve the ballot bases and publicly display the ballot bases so.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I am afraid Friday is out for 50 percent of the Board, maybe more, and doing this tomorrow or Wednesday or even Thursday I am not sure that gives our candidates time to digest it.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Jeff has something to say.

MR. MACKEY: I also expect Friday, the 8th, is the date that the Brice Charter Commission

```
member petitions will be due so I would expect them
 1
     to come in probably that day.
 2
                  CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Meaning you want it
 4
     accurate.
 5
                  MR. MACKEY: We may not be ready on
 6
     Friday depending on when they come in. They
     shouldn't be too hard to check to get done by Monday,
 8
     Tuesday.
 9
                  MEMBER SINNOTT: If we set out a meeting
10
     for the 12th, we will have people to be on the
     Village of Brice.
11
12
                  MR. MACKEY: We'll be done then too.
13
```

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I see a nod from Todd.

MR. WEDEKIND: Yeah, I think the 12th would be the latest you want to go.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: But doable.

MR. WEDEKIND: The 12th.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Everybody's schedule, it's time, but I understand that.

20 MEMBER SINNOTT: 3 o'clock on Tuesday,

the 12th?

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

24

2.2 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Set the meeting for

3 o'clock on the 12th, March 12, at 3 o'clock. 23

MR. ANDERSON: To clean up the record,

might I suggest we table all three of those? I mean,

I think you can do it in one motion to that specific

date in time. In other words, table the Miller

appeal, the Paretti protest, and the Taylor protest

until March 12 at 3 o'clock.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MEMBER SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, I move we table the Miller, Paretti, and Taylor matters until Tuesday, the 12th of March, at 3 p.m.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Is there a second?

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Second.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor aye. Motion carries.

The meeting is scheduled for 3 o'clock, March 12, 2013.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: That sounds like a good plan.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: The next item on the agenda we have League of Women Voters.

MR. MACKEY: Ms. Taylor has a question.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay.

MS. TAYLOR: Good afternoon. Thank you, guys. My question is will these addendums be permitted to continue to come in? Otherwise we are going to be right back at the same impasse so if

another addendum comes in the morning of the 12th, then here we are again. So that is my question. So the addendum this morning came in, I received an e-mail at 11:26 this morning indicating there was an addendum to Ms. Reis's protest. So, again, March 12 another set of -- another set of addendum -- another addendum comes in so my question is will there be a cease on that?

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Well, the challenge is going to run out pretty soon as to what the Board physically can do to meet our statutory deadlines. I don't know if.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: There's nothing we can do. We cannot not turn it into an addendum. That would be stepping on the rights of an individual so we cannot do that.

MS. TAYLOR: Okay.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: At some point if the addendums keep coming in as we get ready to meet, then we are going to run out of time, and the issue will not be on the ballot with our prior -- our prior -- our prior vote on items to the ballot.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Okay.

MS. TAYLOR: Thank you.

2.3

1 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Do you want to 2 proceed? 3 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Yes, sir. Are we 4 ready? 5 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Yeah. 6 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: The next item on the 7 agenda is League of Women Voters' presentation. Last 8 meeting I gave everybody a copy of a packet the 9 League of Women Voters presented to us. They have a 10 proposal to bring before us. I've taken the liberty of getting the two pages of their proposal and so 11 12 take that. 13 And so at this point who is going to come 14 up with the League of Women Voters? 15 MS. PULLES: Thank you for giving us time 16 today on the agenda. My name is Amy Pulles, and I am 17 the President of the League of Women Voters 18 Metropolitan Columbus. Prior to serving as the 19 president, I was the administrator for the League 20 from 2001 through 2012. 21 We are here today to talk about our 2.2 proposal for the Board of Elections to financially support our Voter Information Bulletin in the amount 2.3 24 of \$6,000. In the past -- well, in the fall some

members of our Development Committee had met with Mr. Anthony about ways that the Board of Elections could support the League of Women Voters in our Voting Information Bulletin. In past years the Board of Elections has purchased the back cover — this is a copy of this year's bulletin. And from 2005, general election, 2005, to the general election of 2010, the Board of Elections did purchase the back cover of our Voter Information Bulletin, and you used that as a way to — to inform voters about deadlines, hours, polling locations and so on.

2.2

However, you have not done that since,
like I said, 2010, I believe was the last year. But
anyhow I want to tell you a little bit about the
League in case you didn't know. The mission of the
League of Women Voters is to encourage informed and
active participation in government, work to increase
understanding of major public policies, and influence
public policy through education and advocacy. The
League is where hands-on work to safeguard democracy
leads to specific improvement.

Throughout our last League year we spent a great deal of time coming up with our strategic plan for the next five years and through that we

determined that our focus at the Metropolitan

Columbus level of League of Women Voters was to work

to become the go-to organization in central Ohio for

nonpartisan citizen education, to protect civil

discourse among citizens and legislators with

differing opinions, and encouraging people to work

together in a productive manner that allows for

compromise and positive outcomes for all central

Ohioans and also to engage populations with low

participation rates such as minorities and young

people by teaching them how to get involved in the

political process and providing — by providing them

with the tools and education necessary to advocate

for issues important to them regardless of their

party affiliation.

2.2

2.3

The best way that we currently do that is through the use of our Voter Information Bulletin.

What this is it exists in basically every major city in the entire country. We survey usually starting in July, or actually as soon as the certified list of candidates comes from you guys, we survey. We send out a survey to all of our candidates, questions are decided on from our Board of Directors. The surveys include their education, occupation, and

qualifications for office. And then for major offices like the citywide races and countywide races we also ask them some specific questions.

2.2

2.3

Then once the surveys are returned back we enter their surveys into -- into our bulletin, and they are printed. The responses are printed exactly as they sent them to us. We make no changes. Even typographical errors we do not change. There's a word limit to questions, and after they have reached that word limit, they are cut off. And it says that they have exceeded the word limit. This -- this is distributed through the Columbus Dispatch to anybody who receives the Dispatch on it's usually the second Sunday before the general election. This year we actually had moved it up to the third Sunday before the general election but then -- because of all the absentee voting that's been occurring, but through some confusion it ended up the second week before.

But anyhow it's also available on our website at the end of September, several different sources linking to our website so that people are able to see that it's available.

One tremendous asset for us is the Board of Elections because we receive over a thousand phone

calls from voters in the months of September and October and in the first week — first couple of days of November and I would say that 75 percent of those phone calls start with the Board of Elections told me to call you. And it's what they are looking for is voter service information, information that they can take to the polls to learn about the candidates and that can help them make their decision on voting.

2.3

Another great piece of our Voter

Information Bulletin are our pros and cons we create
on our state issues. We interview -- we study the
issue. We interview people that are for the issue.
We interview who are against the issue. And then we
list bullet points as to why -- why people support or
oppose the issue.

We also give -- provide an explanation of the issue in terms that people can better understand so a lot of times when people get to the ballot or to their voting box and they read the issue, they don't understand it. What does voting yes mean? We say a vote yes means this. A vote no means that just so people are educated when they go to the polls.

One way -- one reason why people don't go vote is because they don't feel like they know

anything. They don't know any of the people they are voting for. They don't know what races they are voting on so they just don't go. Well, our Voter Information Bulletin eliminates that.

2.2

I just don't know anything to try to get them to -- to go vote. We don't like to see low voter turnouts so we are trying to change that. And we have been working for 92 years to try to change that.

wanted to make sure I say that like I had said
earlier we are -- us and the Board of Elections are
already working together by you providing us with -with referrals. You send people to us, like I said,
on a daily basis during election season, and also we
use your -- your website quite a bit. We use it. We
staff the phone bank at WBNS 10TV on election day
when voters call in with questions. And also we get
a lot of calls where people want a sample ballot.
They have no idea you guys have that on your website.
We tell them where to go. They don't have access to
the internet, I print off the sample and mail them a
copy of the Voter Information Ballot with that.

We provide speakers at nursing homes, and

we send sample ballots to all the residents we got from their website along with a copy of the Voter Information Bulletin, but we also think there is a lot of other ways we might be able to work more closely with the Board of Elections to educate voters and to increase voter turnout.

We would love the opportunity to be able to talk to you about that further if anybody has any ideas on ways we might be able to expand our relationship, but we do hope that you will consider our proposal to financially support the efforts. It is for \$6,000. We do have to pay \$5,000 to the Dispatch to print the -- to print it and to circulate it for us. It goes to approximately, give or take what their circulation rate is at the time for Sunday, it can range between 350,000, 450,000 that receive a copy of our Voter Information Bulletin through the Dispatch.

They also provide us with overruns that we give to all the local libraries. We give to United Way Agency. We give them to business. We give them to schools. Anybody who asks for them we provide them copies, as many as they need.

Partnering with the League will ensure

2.

the continuation of the VIB and continued availability of easy access to unbiased information on candidates, issues, and the voting process in Franklin County and also partnering with the League will also help to ensure a level playing field for candidates of all walks of life.

2.2

2.3

Our Voter Information Bulletin provides a free way for candidates to get their information in the hands of voters. So thank you for giving us this time.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Thank you. Are there questions or comments from the Board?

MEMBER SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions for Ms. Pulles. We may -- thank you for joining us today. You are asking for \$6,000 from the Board?

MS. PULLES: Yes.

MEMBER SINNOTT: And then is it true that the Dispatch charges the League \$5,000 to print and distribute the Guide?

MS. PULLES: That's the fee they charge us, \$5,000. It costs them quite a great deal more to do that service for us, but they only ask us for 5,000. And then the additional thousand would be to

help offset the staff time to create the Voter Information Bulletin.

2.2

2.3

MEMBER SINNOTT: So if we were to give you the \$6,000, we would be underwriting the League's entire cost of printing and distributing the Guide plus we would be paying \$1,000 for League staff time?

MS. PULLES: Yeah. Well, the staff time that's put into creating that, yes.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: The advertisement on the back of that VIB, I don't recall ever voting or authorizing that. I wonder if that -- since I have been on the Board. I wonder was that part, do you recall or know, of the general advertising initiative that we have launched over the years?

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: It must have been. We do -- particularly in big cycle years, the even number years, we do spend some -- a substantial amount of money advertising, and I believe that we did put that on part of the advertising in 2010.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: That's what I'm suspecting.

MS. PULLES: Can I say something? As I remember when that first started, at the time the Board of Elections had a requirement to -- to in some

sort of way three times during the election season had to advertise their deadlines, their polling hours, and I think that that's -- it must not be ringing a bell.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I think we are under certain requirements with the newspaper of record; is that correct?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: That's correct.

MS. PULLES: You were using that -- that was justification. You were using that to fulfill one of those three times.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Well, one of the things
I found curious about this matter when I first read
the agenda was whether the Board has the legal
authority to take the taxpayers' money and give it to
a private group which looks to be what is being
requested on the face. I find it interesting that
when the Board has made a payment toward
dissemination of the Voter Guide in the past, it
received some advertising in exchange.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I'm not sure that -- let's get that straight because that wasn't my understanding.

MS. PULLES: The moneys to purchase the

back cover was paid to the Dispatch. That was not paid to us.

2.2

2.3

MEMBER SINNOTT: Paid to the Dispatch.

MS. PULLES: It was paid to the Dispatch.

At the time they did not charge us to print out, only started in the last few years.

MEMBER SINNOTT: That's my most fundamental question here before turning to the merits of whether we want to do this. Do we have the capacity to take people's money and give it to the League of Women Voters or any other private organization?

MR. ANDERSON: Oh, the general rule in Ohio is that lending credit is unconstitutional.

Now, if there is a contractual relationship, if there is a statutory right to procure a particular service or good, then that's not lending credit issue. I have not -- I don't know that I would have sufficient information about what's going on here to opine today as to whether that's a valid legal expenditure.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Let me ask a side question too, the League does not endorse or support candidates.

MS. PULLES: No, we do not.

2.2

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: But speak to the issue of issues.

MS. PULLES: Okay. The League at the state and national level of the League of Women Voters they do have an active advocacy arm that focuses on good government and voter protection advocacy. Throughout our 92-year history that has not been a partisan issue. They do take through our process of study and consensus, all of our members do, we do create positions on issues and then we go out and we can — as long as we have a position, then the state and national — then the League of Women Voters can advocate on a particular issue. When we come to those — our positions, they are not done based on any party opinion or any party — any party's platform. They are based directly on study and consensus among our members.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So the League does endorse or take positions on issues, ballot issues.

MS. PULLES: Yes, yes, at the state and national level. At the local level we focus on citizen education.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: All right. I think we

have enough information to study this further internally, but it sounds like, I think they are only two lawyers up here, have pointed out in questions we would want to make sure we protect the Board, the public body, as well as the League from doing something improper.

2.2

MS. PULLES: Right, right.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: And we are well aware of the work over the 92 years, and I think we have plenty of information to study that further.

Other thoughts or questions?

MEMBER MANIFOLD: I would just say thank you for coming down. You guys do great work.

MS. PULLES: Thank you.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: It easily makes sense to buy an ad on here but \$6,000 for the back page of that ad for my money we pay --

MS. PULLES: I wanted to say that even if you are not able to financially support us, your purchasing of that ad kept the Dispatch doing it because it was funding that they were receiving for it so that's another way to support us is to continue placing that ad.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: I was going to say we

usually have a decent amount of money in our advertising budget in the fall. I think it's usually late summer that we do our advertising budget. Make sure you work with these guys.

2.2

2.3

MS. PULLES: Yeah, we will.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: That's way more than — what we pay on a T.V. ad is just ridiculous. The amount of money they spend for a 30-second ad is probably more money than that and that reaches way more people so I would gladly. Work with us, see what we can do.

MS. PULLES: Okay. Good.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Thank you very much.

MS. PULLES: Thanks for your time.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is directive 2013-11, the Secretary of State's Office that advises the Board of Elections to look into any kind of fraud or voter suppression issues that have been in the 2012 election cycle. Dana and I have had a conference call with the Secretary of State's Office about this.

And part of the directive says that citizen groups are allowed to present those to us for

the Board -- if the Board uncovers anything, any kind of fraud or voter suppression, that we have to have the Board sit and discuss it. We do have before you today more details on several -- a number of issues. There may have been some fraudulent activities and we need to subpoena individuals to come to provide additional documentation to us, we could make that so we could get more information, figure out how to proceed.

2.2

2.3

As part of the conversation today as well, we would like to talk about possibly holding a public session where we would invite groups to come in and tell us if they know of voter fraud or voter suppression. We did something similar, I believe, 2000 -- I forgot the year now.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: These are two separate issues?

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Yeah, two separate issues but the same issue so the first one we want to talk about would be the issuing of subpoenas for individuals who we suspect voted — voted more than once. And I'll let Dana go through — do you have a list for them of individuals?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: You do have in

your packets today, each one of you should have a little binder clip, on it seven instances that we have identified through our normal course of business here at the Board putting in vote histories, updating histories, et cetera, after the election.

2.2

2.3

What has been normal procedure of the Board from my understanding in the past, my limited knowledge of it, been through one instance of it, but through historical nature, also working with the Prosecutor's Office is that they ask us to do some additional research into any case that we might have like this and that would begin with not only the documentation that we can provide here but then also calling folks in to talk to them to discuss these matters with them.

In your binder there you have seven different cases that are stapled together. The first one deals with an instance where we believe the voter registered to vote here in Franklin County voted in Franklin County after having passed an absentee ballot in Montgomery County, and the documentation is there showing that.

And then the remaining six instances are people that we suspect voted in an absentee ballot by

mail and then voted also in person at our vote center on Morse Road. We identified these six instances immediately following the election, in the day or two after the election, and we're actually able to go back because at the vote center we had — since we were voting on the machines, our electronic voting machines, we coded each one of the ballots that were cast there. We're required to do that during the golden week period, but we opted for consistency sake just to continue to do that throughout the entire in-person absentee voting session, the entire 35 days.

2.2

2.3

So when this -- these situations presented themselves where somebody had voted via mail by absentee and then also in-person absentee, we were able to go back into the machines and pull those votes out of the machines so that each one of these individuals only had one vote count in this election.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: On this case that is Rosemary Begallian, there is a facsimile of an application to vote absentee, the second page was a second request that was rejected?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: That's correct.

24 CHAIRMAN PREISSE: The third page, is

that the documentation of having voted at the early vote center?

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: That's correct.

As you can see, that's an absentee voter request, but in the upper right-hand corner of that there is a sticker that was over that and that identifies it as absentee ballot application applied for at our early vote center.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: And executed at the same time.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: That's correct, sir, and then the final page of that one would be the copy of her mail-in absentee ballot, the identification envelope that came with that.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Is that pattern there replicated in the other five?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: That's correct.

MEMBER SINNOTT: So the Board has statutory subpoena authority?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

MEMBER SINNOTT: And the staff is proposing that we compel these people to come where?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Come to the Board of Elections to be interviewed by staff here at the

Board of Elections about these -- these instances.

2.

2.2

MEMBER SINNOTT: To answer questions from the Board staff, right?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: That's correct.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Under oath?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Yes. We would have a court reporter there as per the directive Bill mentioned earlier. We would have a court reporter there to document the entire session, and it would then be after that interview and any subsequent documentation that would be provided by the voter or by the Board itself to then make any recommendation to you, Members of the Board, if we felt this needed further action through the Prosecutor's Office.

So the first step in this would be calling these individuals into the office to interview them under oath, and we would present doing that via the Board issuing subpoenas to these seven individuals to come in.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Is that a recorded interview?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Yes. We would have a court reporter there to do an entire transcript of the interview.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Have we attempted any informal communication with these folks about what they did?

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Not as of this point, no. The only instance we have had of there being any communication on this -- on any of these issues is the one instance is Mr. Herron, Douglas Herron, who actually self-reported himself to the Bureau of Criminal Investigation or whatever, it's called BCI, and realized that he might have done something wrong after -- but after he did it. But we have not spoken with Mr. Herron. That is through a phone conversation that was given to the -- from BCI.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: They alerted us that he told them.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: That's correct. The call was from BCI, not from Mr. Herron.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: The interviews would take place in these offices at a Board meeting or?

MR. ANDERSON: If you issue a subpoena, the subpoena would be to a Board meeting. Informally I think what Dana is saying is that you would request they come in and meet with staff informally. Absent that then you would look at the Board's subpoena

authority.

2.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Brad's question is a transcript would relate to an interview subsequent to the subpoena.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: What I was proposing was that we issue a subpoena for these individuals to come in and speak with Board staff but make that under oath in front of a court reporter, also to allow the staff to do initial research into these matters before presenting the evidence to you four Members of the Board for any formal action on it.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Does that work, Harold?

MR. ANDERSON: I'll have to -- I think so, but I would have to look at the code. This is a little -- this shades to the criminal, and I'm not a criminal attorney so.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: You know, when I was on the Board a number of years ago, we had a situation where a gentleman voted twice and we were advised, we subpoenaed an individual to a Board meeting, and then the individual had to come before the Board and then explain what had happened and then

the Board made a decision. So, I mean, that's the way I remember doing it so I'm not sure if that — that was the advice we had gotten so I don't know what that means presently but.

2.2

2.3

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Yeah, I'm not sure the thought -- the directive was put on the Board.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: So anyway we had an individual come before the Board, subpoenaed them, they came in for a Board meeting, and then they presented their — the Board then asked questions, and we would provide you guys with the task, and then the individual answered the questions and then based on the answers, the Board made a determination to prosecute the person or not.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: You are not allowed to vote twice, and we have pretty good evidence that seven persons have so we must take action.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: I guess my question is did they -- the second -- so they came into the vote center after they had mailed back their absentee ballot, right, like in the mail?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: That's correct.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: But the -- but we know they are marked in the book, they show up there, they

vote, the ballot has been marked, they can't vote.

They voted a provisional ballot, right?

2.

2.2

and Todd is still here, Todd might pipe in on this, it's been the past practice of the Board if somebody had requested an absentee ballot and then come to the vote center, that's because that is also absentee voting. It was considering a case of where something happened to the initial ballot, and, thus, it was a new ballot was reissued to them. That was a decision, I believe, Todd, if I am correct, was made a number of years ago through Board procedure that we kept going through this year.

We have had discussions of coming before you to change that for the future because we do have these instances where I don't know what they might have said to the clerk at the early vote center, to say I threw that away, I misplaced it, I didn't vote. I have no idea what they might have said that would have led the clerk at the vote center to issue them another authority to vote slip for the in-person and at the center. But in these cases these voters not only mail an absentee vote but then also came in in person.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Okay.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Yeah, Todd.

MR. WEDEKIND: Okay. Previously what we would do would be have the voter provisional ballot. Years back we would do that. The previous administrator wanted us to treat it like a second ballot request and treat it the same so like someone, you know, I lost it, whatever, we would issue the second ballot. So this administrator wanted us to change from giving them a provisional ballot to letting them vote on the machine just as we would as if it was a second request. So that's why we have done it that way. The ballot is coded so we can always pull it out as we did with these individuals so, you know, future discussions I think we would like to go back to going back to making the voter provisional ballot if they, in fact, have already requested an absentee. It would end up being the same situation but I think there --CHAIRMAN PREISSE: In your scenario they

would have a chance to only count one.

MR. WEDEKIND: Only count one.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: These votes have been counted twice.

MR. WEDEKIND: No. They were only counted once.

1

2

4

5

6

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Since we had coded the ballots at the vote center on the vote machines as we are able to do once we identified this a day or two after when we did the official canvass of votes, we were able to go back in and get those votes out of the machines.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: At the early vote center.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: That's correct.

MR. WEDEKIND: So there was only one

counted.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: It's like a provisional without an envelope.

MR. WEDEKIND: Exactly the way we used to vote when we get provisionals on the DREs. This is exactly the same pro -- a provisional code is put in for the provisional, and then once we determine whether it is to be counted or not to be counted, we either leave it in or pull it out and that's the same way with those.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Okay.

MEMBER SINNOTT: I'm in favor.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ ANDERSON: It's the attempt that's the problem.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Right.

2.2

2.3

MR. ANDERSON: Whether there were two counted ballots or not, even the attempt is the law.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Got that. I am in favor of investigating this, but I'm unclear as to what to say in a motion authorizing issuing subpoenas because I'm not sure that we have figured out what our investigative process is going to be here. Usually if you want information from a witness, your first step is to pick up and call and say, hey, I want to talk to you about what happened. And if that person wouldn't talk to you, you have a subpoena authority available to you, then you take that step. I don't think we've done that yet. Perhaps we haven't done it trying to be compliant with an SOS directive.

It's not clear to me whether we want to direct these people to show up at the Board's office at any particular time to be interviewed by the director or we want to summon that person to the Board meeting to be examined by the Board Members.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: May I interject? As I glance at the recent directive, refresh us as to what

that directs us to do in this circumstance or similar circumstances.

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: It directs us to investigate any credible allegations we have of vote fraud or any vote suppression, and it says that the Board must hold a public hearing at which electors —qualified electors may provide sworn testimony or affidavits in support of the alleged acts.

I read that as that meant if somebody made an allegation to us to have in these instances brought forward today are ones that we have uncovered here at the Board our past — our protocol that we have with the Prosecutor's Office does allude to staff looking into these allegations prior to anything being brought to you for any formal action of any sort.

You could advise us to simply try and contact these people and get them in to interview them. And if they don't, then subpoen them. I mean, I think we have discretion here as to how we want to proceed in this. Our thought originally was to go ahead and just subpoen them in to come and meet with staff and talk with them but if there's a different course the Board would like us to take,

that's certainly, I think, within your discretion depending on any, you know, other idea from counsel, I quess.

2.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: Let me jump ahead just a bit. Were we to fill in the middle part which we are discussing now and find something actual, our recourse would be to refer that to the Prosecutor's Office, wouldn't it be?

MR. ANDERSON: Correct.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: So we are trying to gather information to perhaps refer or not, that's the Board's decision to refer to the Prosecutor.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: That's correct.

Over the summer, Mr. Chairman, for example, we did uncover a few instances of three voters of 2008 that we alleged voted twice. We went ahead and conducted interviews with those three individuals, presented evidence to you of not only the interview with them but documentation as I am showing you here today, at which time you then — the Members of the Board took action to refer the matter over to the Prosecutor's Office.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, I ask, if

this makes sense, in light of the fact we have a meeting next Tuesday of the Board, what if staff were to undertake to communicate with these folks in question between now and Tuesday if they are responsive and start information flowing to the Board. And if they are unresponsive, then on Tuesday we can consider a particular motion drafted in advance that would invoke the Board's subpoena authority.

2.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: That sounds like a logical procedure. I wonder if we shouldn't put in writing as soon as we can to these seven individuals a description of what the fact pattern is as we understand it and why we are contacting them.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Sure. We can do that.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: I think that makes a lot of sense because I know how we have done it in the past. The directive kind of threw me for a loop because it seems a bit more we had to conduct here.

MEMBER SINNOTT: I think in these cases we are really doing nothing besides our traditional identification for the Prosecutor's consideration of voting statute violations.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Yeah.

2.2

MEMBER SINNOTT: But then the idea of having a public forum where people can come and make allegations of voter suppression or voter fraud, that's -- that's innovative. I've never done that before.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: We haven't done it since I have been here, but Bill thought he remembered a time when he did it after the 2008 election; is that correct, Bill?

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: It might have been the 2004 election. How long have you been --

 $\label{eq:chairman preisse: I may not have been} % \begin{center} \begin{center$

here. There was a lot of angst about voter, you know — just a lot of questions about voter integrity of our system and whether it was voter suppression or not and so — and I was Chairman of the Board at the time, and we decided to hold a public meeting. I think Matt was the Director and Hackett was Deputy Director or vice versa and we held the meeting in here and about 30 or 40 people showed up, might have been more than that, and we gave them the opportunity

to present whatever they had to present to us and we took -- we had a court reporter. And we had a court reporter and we took notes and in the end we did a report on all -- and we looked into all the allegations and exhaustive report on how public -- how we addressed all the issues that were brought before us, and it seemed after we did that, the report then, we haven't had -- then after that, we had some more open dialogue. So that's how I remember us doing it and it had to have been after the 2004 election.

2.2

2.3

MR. WEDEKIND: It was '04.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: It was '04? Okay.

MEMBER SINNOTT: Mr. Chairman, what if we ask the staff to prepare a motion for our consideration next Tuesday that would comply with the directive's requirement of any -- to have a public meeting for the purpose of receiving comments on voter suppression or voter fraud?

MEMBER MANIFOLD: Sounds like a great idea.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Do you want to include these seven in with that or?

MEMBER SINNOTT: No.

CHAIRMAN PREISSE: I think we are resolved to go ahead and take a look by written and telephonic communication with those seven what is going on. But then getting to those I think Brad says — talks about having a public hearing on various issues. Let's see where those two meet and make sense for us to proceed.

2.2

2.3

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: And in '04, if I recall correctly, we used to send out a letter to invite community groups, that we reached out to a lot of community groups. Anyway we did a broad sweep trying to get as many folks at the meeting as possible. But, yes, we can do that.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: So is it the decision, just so I'm clear on this, that for the seven voters in question we will try to contact by mail and phone to have them appear at our March 12 meeting?

MEMBER SINNOTT: No.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: To come in and be interviewed by staff.

MEMBER SINNOTT: As I think the Board has -- the Board staff has done in the past go ahead and contact the seven people we think voted twice and

interview them about whether they voted twice. And if they refuse to communicate with us then or if our communication is unsatisfactory, then draft a motion for us to consider on Tuesday that would compel them to come to the Board's office and under oath give testimony on the subject.

2.2

2.3

And I think we ought to treat those as apples and then we have the orange of the public forum that perhaps we're obliged to have where people can come and say whatever they want to say about voter suppression or voter fraud.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Now, I was just advised that at this time that seven, if there is any others, we ought to include it. I mean --

DEPUTY DIRECTOR WALCH: Yeah, no, I would agree with that. These are the only seven that have been brought to my attention so far so they are the only ones I have at this point so. But if any would come to our attention, certainly at any time we would certainly look into it and do our due diligence on checking out the circumstances surrounding it.

MEMBER MANIFOLD: I would just add you guys check in the Secretary of State's Office, make sure that meets the outline of the directive.

```
85
                  MEMBER SINNOTT: I move we adjourn.
 1
 2
                  MEMBER MANIFOLD: Second.
                  MEMBER MARINELLO: Second, third.
 3
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor.
 4
                  We stand adjourned.
 5
                  (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at
 6
 7
      5:06 p.m.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Monday, March 4, 2013, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

9 Karen Sue Gibson, Registered Merit Reporter.

11 (KSG-5673)