BEFORE THE OHIO BOARD OF ELECTIONS SPECIAL MEETING

PROCEEDINGS

before Douglas Preiss, Chairman, Zachary Manifold, Bradley Sinnott, and Kimberly Marinello, Board Members, at the Board of Elections, 280 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, First Floor, Columbus, Ohio, called at 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 6, 2013.

_ _ _

Also Present:

Dana Walch, Deputy Director Jeffrey Mackey, Manager, Election Operations

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.

222 East Town Street, 2nd Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
Fax - (614) 224-5724

_ _ _

2.

Thursday Morning Session, 1 2 June 6, 2013. 3 4 MR. WALCH: I'd like go ahead and call 5 this meeting of the Franklin County Board of Elections to order. Start with the roll call. 6 7 Kimberly Marinello. MS. MARINELLO: Here. 8 9 MR. WALCH: Zachary Manifold. Here. 10 MR. MANIFOLD: MR. WALCH: Doug Preisse. 11 12 MR. PREISSE: Here. 13 MR. WALCH: Bradley Sinnott. MR. SINNOTT: Here. 14 MR. WALCH: We have all members present. 15 16 First issue on the agenda today, as you 17 all know, there's been a resignation in the office of 18 Municipal Court judge in the Environmental Division, 19 there were four candidates who filed petitions during 20 the window to file. And we have checked those 2.1 petitions and in Exhibit A in your materials today 22 you should have a breakdown of how each one of them did. 23 24 All four did meet the validity and 25 sufficiency requirements of the filing. And it is

our recommendation that all four of those candidates be certified to the ballot for November 5, 2013.

2.0

2.1

MR. SINNOTT: Just a point of information, what's the last day by which a candidate can ask to withdraw from candidacy and have his name removed from the ballot?

MR. WALCH: Well, a candidate can withdraw at any point the candidate desires. To have them have their name replaced?

MR. SINNOTT: No, just withdraw from so you're not printed on the ballot.

MR. WALCH: It always varies slightly by where we are in the process of getting the ballots ready. It's about 60-65 days.

MR. SINNOTT: There we go.

MR. WALCH: That's our best estimate.

MR. SINNOTT: Thanks.

MR. MANIFOLD: Mr. Chairman, I move the Board certify to the November 5, 2013, General Election ballot those candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Environmental Division, appearing on Exhibit A whose petitions were found to be valid and sufficient.

MR. WALCH: Second?

MS. MARINELLO: Second.

MR. WALCH: All those in favor?

(All ayes heard.)

MR. WALCH: Opposed?

Motion passes.

2.0

2.1

The next item on your agenda today is we received 37 voter registration challenges filed by Ms. Carol Bicking of 1599 Climbing Fig Drive, in Blacklick. I would like to call on Renee Klco, our Manager of Voter Services, to provide the Board with our research on each of those challenges and the staff recommendation on each.

MS. KLCO: Good morning. You have two — there were two separate challenges filed; one had 32 on it, one had five. The one with the 32, these are normal procedures that we follow anytime there is a — somebody tries to register at a restricted address.

Of those 32, 16 voters we recommend that we're going to change the voter registration back to their previous one except for the exception of the gentleman who lives in his truck; he will now be registered at the homeless shelter. We will be sending a letter to both the previous address and the P.O. Box requesting the residential address be validated and explain that the P.O. Box can be used

as a mailing address.

2.0

2.1

The other 16 voters we will place in a pending P.O. address status, which is a nonvoting status. We will send a letter to the P.O. Box, requesting a residential address and explaining again that the P.O. Box can be used as a mailing address.

The other challenge with the five voters, we have four voters that we will change their voter address back to the previous one, send a letter both to the previous address and the P.O. Box requesting residential address and again explaining that P.O. Box can be used as a mailing address.

We have one voter we will be placing in a pending P.O. address status, again, a nonvoting status, and again sending a letter to the P.O. Box requesting the residential address and explaining that the P.O. Box can be used as a mailing address.

MR. SINNOTT: As a preliminary matter, the Board has two exhibits in front of it, both marked Exhibit B.

MR. WALCH: Those refer to the two filings on this, the one with 32 cases on it and the other with five cases on it. They should be combined in one. They are both marked Exhibit B.

MR. SINNOTT: They're both B.

MR. WALCH: That's correct.

2.0

2.1

MR. PREISSE: Would you recap what Renee just told us as it relates to sort of what we're looking at here?

MR. WALCH: In front of you Exhibit B in that spreadsheet, each one of the voters whose registration has been challenged with the address on there and the resolution as is recommended by the staff here at the office in the far right column.

If a voter had a previous address prior to the P.O. Box that's being challenged, we will send those voters a letter both at the P.O. Box that we have for them and the residential address that we have for them, explaining that they need to clarify the situation and provide us with a residential address which is what's required for voter registration purposes.

For those voters who we only have a P.O. address for, which could be, for example, a first time voter that we have no other record for at this time, those voters will be sent a letter from our office, they will be put in a P.O. Box status, which is a nonvoting status, until such time as they respond back to us and provide us with a residential address from which they can be registered to vote.

Is there a certain timeline on that,
Renee?

2.0

2.1

MS. KLCO: Six months.

MR. WALCH: If they do not respond to us back in six months, their registration will be cancelled. Correct?

MS. KLCO: Correct.

MR. WALCH: I also do have here today
Carolyn Gorup who is our manager of IT. Usually all
of these instances that we have restricted addresses
in our voter registration file. When we did the
redistricting process at the beginning of the year
where we had to put new information in the file, for
some reason these — the flags on these ranges of
addresses got taken off for some reason.

Carolyn, I don't know if you have additional detail other than that? We have now re-restricted these addresses so that it would prevent us from putting in the first place.

MS. GORUP: I don't really have anything additional; you told them everything I was going to say.

In 2011 when we were doing redistricting we went through several gradations of the file, and then the Congressional district lines were drawn and

redrawn. Somewhere in that process we lost the restricted mailing address flag and operations then had to go back in and manually insert that, and these addresses got missed.

MR. WALCH: Additional questions for Renee or Carolyn?

2.1

MR. SINNOTT: So to make this really simple, I am one of the challenged voters on Exhibit B and if the Board acts in a fashion recommended by the staff, then I'll be getting a letter?

MR. WALCH: That's correct.

MR. SINNOTT: And that letter will tell me that I should contact the Board, correct?

MR. WALCH: That's correct.

MR. SINNOTT: And provide -- confirm, perhaps, my current address information.

MR. WALCH: Residential address information, yes. They could use a Post Office box for mailing purposes but for the purpose of voter registration they must provide us with a residential address from which they are to be registered from.

So if you want to, if you're registered at 123 Elm Street but want all of your mail to be sent to P.O. Box 52, you can do that but we need a

residential address for voter registration purposes.

2.1

If this had been a -- if these addresses had not been inadvertently unrestricted, for lack of a better word, in our file, if somebody had registered to vote with us -- and Renee, correct me if I make a mistake -- if a voter sent us in a voter registration with just a P.O. Box on it, we would send them a letter saying you cannot be registered from just a P.O. Box, please provide us with a residential address.

They would go into other file in the P.O. Box pending status, which is a nonvoting status, until such time as they provided us with a residential address.

MS. KLCO: Attached to that letter is also a registration form and a postage paid return envelope so that we get it back promptly.

MR. PREISSE: I think we -- I think, Ms. Bicking, is that you?

MS. BICKING: Yes.

MR. PREISSE: I recognize you from last time. I think you addressed the Board last time you visited us. Do you wish to do that today?

MS. BICKING: Just briefly.

MR. PREISSE: Okay. Please do so. State

your name and address for the record.

2.1

MS. BICKING: I'm Carol Bicking, my address is 1599 Climbing Fig Drive, Blacklick, Ohio, 43004.

And my husband and I did this ahead of Secretary of State Husted's directive on the 23rd to make sure that no UPS stores or U.S. Post Offices were people addressed to register to vote.

I have an additional -- I have a copy of additional Post Offices and UPS stores beyond the ones that were flagged for this meeting purposes. So I have just one copy but I'd be glad to give it to you so that she can easily do her flag to flag the addresses, the Post Offices and UPS stores that she should have on her list.

MR. PREISSE: Are you suggesting you believe you've discovered additional registrations which --

MS. BICKING: No, no, I'm not suggesting that at all. But when I began this project, I got a list from the Internet and the phone book of U.S. Post Offices in Franklin County and UPS stores in Franklin County area, so if there are any beyond what came up as the stores that were there.

MR. PREISSE: Sure, that would be --

thank you.

2.1

MR. WALCH: I think that would be helpful to us. What I would suggest is, Ms. Bicking, at the conclusion of our meeting go to our front desk just so we can time stamp it in so it's official, as we do with all documents here. We try to make sure they get time stamped so we make sure we exactly did get them.

I think we can certainly have those looked at. We can look at those and make sure we have them flagged.

MS. BICKING: Because the one at Secretary Husted's declaration to flag those stores for future purposes. Does anyone have any questions or anything?

MR. PREISSE: No. Thank you for that helpful information.

MR. WALCH: Mr. Chairman, we do have every person that was challenged on this list was sent a letter saying they could appear today if they so desired to address the Board. I did get from Suzanne that Mr. Dave Sanders is here and might want to speak to the Board briefly.

Mr. Sanders, are you here? Okay, great.

If you'd come on up and just give your name and

address for the record so we have that on record.

2.1

at all?

MR. SANDERS: My name is Dave Sanders and my address as you currently have it is the 605 North High Street address, and that is my mailing address, and I have in my hand a voter registration form which I will go ahead and update with my residence address. And I'll continue to use the address that you have as my mailing address.

MR. PREISSE: Thank you, Mr. Sanders.

MR. WALCH: Any questions for Mr. Sanders

Okay, thank you very much.

Thank you, Ms. Bicking, also.

Any more discussion on this?

MR. MANIFOLD: I have a quick question for Carolyn, maybe she answered it. Carolyn, I know last year we did kind of a policy and procedures and forms and we had a contractor come in and set up like how we should be doing things. Since this is only every ten years, and who knows how many of us are going to be here in ten years, should we develop — have we developed — have you set up kind of a policy/procedures, can we make sure next time we do census if none of us are around?

MS. GORUP: We haven't formalized

anything but I think Renee and I have both said 1 2 before we do it we'll get a list of the restricted 3 addresses and check them. 4 MR. MANIFOLD: I'd love to see, maybe it 5 makes sense, some sort of formalized procedure. 6 Thank you. 7 MR. PREISSE: Good luck. 8 MR. WALCH: We will certainly discuss 9 that and put something together. 10 MR. PREISSE: Anything further, thoughts or questions? 11 12 Okay, then. 13 MS. MARINELLO: Mr. Chairman, I move the Board accept the recommendation of the Board of 14 Election staff listed in Exhibit B regarding voter 15 16 registration challenges as filed by Ms. Carol Bicking 17 of 1599 Climbing Fig Drive, Blacklick, Ohio.

MR. WALCH: Second on that?

MR. MANIFOLD: Second.

MR. WALCH: All those in favor say aye.

(All ayes heard.)

MR. WALCH: Opposed?

Motion passes.

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

The final item on our agenda is discussion regarding observer appointments in the

2012 general election. Mr. Manifold, I think this is a question you had today so I will turn it over to you.

2.1

MR. MANIFOLD: I really just wanted to get an update to make sure it hadn't fallen through the cracks. I know that we have a new manager for the petitions filings department and I know we rejected these observer forms. I think it was November 5, I think it was a Monday before the election, November 5.

MR. WALCH: I believe that's correct, yes.

MR. MANIFOLD: And we kind of internally discussed although we're not going to take these to the staff, but looking at this and started to investigate and see what happened. I didn't know if there was an update, had we brought in I think the person that filed these was I think it was Ms. Loar, I think Jan was her name.

But it looks like a filing, a fax number and a number for looks like Dublin Pediatrics, which I guess her husband's a sole practitioner there. We have fax form, cover sheet, whatever you want.

So I wanted to get an update, I didn't know if Jeff had an update or Dana, where we're at on

this. Have we brought her in and questioned how she filed an observer form October 5 -- October 25, 2012?

MR. PREISSE: What are you looking at?

This?

2.1

MR. MANIFOLD: Yeah, the form. The form date's -- five candidates. At a point these observers -- the election and it says October 25, 2012. And then assuming that she did collect the signatures, which the concern we had was these five, I think all five candidates filed the I think October 1 and October 2 of 2012. A notice saying that these people didn't have their approval to do these observers so I wondered where we're at in the process and do we have an update?

MR. WALCH: We did not do anything further with this after the election other than the day before the election when all this came about through conversation we had with legal counsel on this. I believe you and I maybe even discussed this the day before the election and that we were going to deny seating, however you want to phrase it, of those observers filed.

Because of that I thought that was what was the ending resolution of this. I thought that was to everybody's satisfaction, but if there is more

that this Board desires to do, I will -- staff here will proceed to do anything you would like to us to do.

2.1

MR. PREISSE: This is coming back into my memory because of the discussion you guys are having, but I don't recall, Zack, are you suggesting that we intended to do something other than accept the candidate's withdrawal letters and then deny the seating of these observers? I don't recall.

MR. MANIFOLD: Yeah, I think we definitely just talked about rejecting and the day before the election, so I think we talked about that we'll look at this post-election and see how this happened or how this form came to be.

I'm just curious, I'd like to know how the signatures got on this form dated October 25, 2012. I don't know, I'm just curious as to how it happened. I mean, clearly I don't know.

MR. SINNOTT: I see the point. I think that we maybe ought to inquire into this because it looks as though all of these candidates withdrew from the project, if you will, in early October, and then their signatures appointing observers appear on a document where the signatures are supposedly dated October 25. That's odd.

MR. WALCH: Which after discussion with counsel was exactly why we denied the appointments and instructed our voting location managers not to seat any of those people as observers in the election.

2.1

We also did a robo-call to each one to instruct them if anybody came in with an observer appointment form representing these -- a committee of these five individuals, they were not to be sworn in as seated observers.

MR. MANIFOLD: So I guess we need a formal motion to -- I'd love to have Jeff and the bipartisan staff bring in Ms. Loar and invite inquiry as to how this form came to be. Is there any objection to having the staff notarize a letter?

MR. SINNOTT: I don't think we need a motion on that; I think we indicate that since the Board is granting the staff with the task of inquiring along of the lines of what you just described, that seems to be sufficient.

Mr. Chairman?

MR. PREISSE: I don't have any problem with that. It is strange this is dated well after the withdrawals and the people fill petitions, this is a petition -- fill petitions out incorrectly by

filling it out after they circulated it and putting the later date. Which of course validates the petition. I don't know whether that -- I probably would reject it because I do remember conversation were they able to withdraw.

2.0

2.1

MALE VOICE: Which I believe the answer to that was they were not able to withdraw the observers at the early voting center but upon receiving this letter, these letters in October was sufficient to the deny seating them.

MR. WALCH: That's correct, that's what happened. And after discussion with counsel on the initial filing which was for the early voting center, since those had been filed and then the letters came in post that initial appointment for the vote center, since there is no mechanism in law to actually revoke or withdraw your appointments, it was counsel's thought that they could have observers —

MR. PREISSE: That's helpful, that's what I remember.

MR. WALCH: Your recollection is correct.

MR. MANIFOLD: And I heard different rumors as to how these signatures ended up on this form. So I'd love to hear a real explanation as to how this happened.

```
19
                  I think that's all I have.
 1
 2
                  MR. PREISSE: Bring Mr. Anthony up to
      date and I think that would be illuminating to us
 3
      all.
 4
 5
                  MR. WALCH: Sounds good. We'll do that
 6
      at the end of business today.
 7
                  MR. SINNOTT: I move we adjourn.
 8
                  MS. MARINELLO: Second.
 9
                  MR. WALCH: All those in favor say aye.
                  (All ayes heard.)
10
                  MR. WALCH: We stand adjourned. Thank
11
12
      you.
                  (Hearing adjourned at 11:10 a.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
2.1
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Thursday, June 6, 2013, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Julieanna Hennebert, Registered Professional Reporter and RMR and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio.

My commission expires February 19, 2018.

(72552 - jul)

2.1