BEFORE THE FRANKLIN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS

- - -

In Re: :

:

Regular Meeting

- - -

PROCEEDINGS

before Director William A. Anthony, Jr., Deputy
Director Dana Walch, and Board Members Kimberly E.
Marinello, Bradley K. Sinnott, and Gregory K. Haas at
the Franklin County Board of Elections, 1700 Morse
Road, Columbus, Ohio, called at 3:30 p.m. on Monday,
February 2, 2015.

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.

222 East Town Street, 2nd 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. Tim Lecklider
 3
             Assistant Prosecuting Attorney
             373 South High Street, 13th Floor
             Columbus, Ohio 43215
 4
 5
                  On behalf of the Board.
 6
      ALSO PRESENT:
 7
             Ms. Suzanne Brown,
             Executive Assistant to the Board
 8
             Ms. Chelsea Faulkner,
 9
             Office of the Secretary of State.
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 Minutes	4
5	Voter Registration Challenges	5
6	EMCS Contract Renewal	7
7	Adjourn	17
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

4 1 2 PROCEEDINGS 3 4 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Good afternoon, 5 everyone. I will call the Franklin County Board of 6 Elections meeting to order. 7 The roll call, Kimberly Marinello. 8 MS. MARINELLO: Here. 9 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Gregory Haas. 10 MR. HAAS: Here. 11 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: And Bradley Sinnott. 12 MR. SINNOTT: Here. 13 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: We do have a quorum 14 present. 15 And the first item on the agenda would be 16 the approval of the minutes for the December 18, 2014 17 and the January 5, 2015 meeting. 18 MR. HAAS: I move that this Board approve the minutes of December 18, 2014 and the January 5, 19 20 2015 of the Franklin County Board of Elections as 21 submitted. 2.2 MR. SINNOTT: Second. 2.3 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor. 24 (Vote taken; motion passed.)

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: I will pass this around for everyone to sign.

The second item on the agenda would be the voter registration challenges.

Dana.

MR. WALCH: We had 28 voter registration challenges that were filed by Ms. Carol Bicking of 1599 Climbing Fig Drive, Blacklick, Ohio. The challenges were properly filed. We sent notice to everybody whose voter registration was challenged explaining that they could attend the Board meeting and speak on their behalf or be represented by counsel, as is true anytime a voter registration challenge is submitted, which is according to law and the direction of the Secretary of State's Office.

So first usually what we do, is there anybody whose registration was challenged who is in attendance today?

I don't think I see anybody, other than some familiar faces that I see. I see that

Ms. Bicking is here.

Ms. Bicking, do you want to say anything
prior to us --

MS. BICKING: Not really.

MR. WALCH: The staff here at the Board did investigate all these, as we always do. We not only use the evidence given to us by the person making the challenge, but we obviously follow up on that and ensure that everything is in order.

2.2

2.3

The 28 registrations that were challenged in this case -- I forget how many addresses it was, 20 addresses, maybe -- were found to be vacant lots. A number of them, the houses had been torn down within the last year or two. We did confirm that through the County Auditor's Office and through the U.S. Postal Service for legitimate mailing addresses and did find all of these to not be at this time operative, for lack of a better word, operative addresses.

The recommendation of our staff -- and we did have a bipartisan team in our Voter Services

Department check into all of this. What our recommendation is to you is to keep these people on the list, on the voter registration list, but restrict those addresses because there is no dwelling there anymore, but keep the people on the list, and they would then be required to vote a provisional ballot if they do attempt to vote at a different

7 This keeps them on the list but requires 1 address. them to vote a provisional if they've moved and just 3 not updated their address. 4 MR. SINNOTT: All 28 represent the same 5 situation? 6 MR. WALCH: Yes. 7 MR. SINNOTT: Registered to a vacant lot? 8 MR. WALCH: That's correct. So our recommendation here is in Exhibit 9 10 A, which has been our usual practice with similar 11 situations in the past. 12 MS. MARINELLO: I move that the Board 13 accept the recommendation of the Board of Elections 14 staff listed in Exhibit A regarding that voter registration challenges filed by Ms. Carol Bicking of 15 16 1599 Climbing Fig Drive, Blacklick, Ohio. DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Is there a second? 17 18 MR. SINNOTT: Second. 19 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor say 20 aye. 21 (Vote taken; motion passed.) 2.2 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Motion carries. 2.3 The next item on the agenda would be the

contract with EMCS. They basically support our voter

24

This is the vendor that does

```
registration system.
```

MR. WALCH:

2.2

our Integrity voter registration system. This was a contract executed a couple years ago that did have three -- what's the word I'm looking for,

Counselor? -- extensions to it. This would be the final year extension on that contract. They provided us very good service in the past. They're actually the ones who developed the system to begin with so it makes them uniquely qualified to provide service to us on this. So we are asking for your approval for an extension on that contract in the amount of \$51,051.26 for calendar year 2015.

MR. HAAS: I move that the Board authorize the director and deputy direct to enter into a subcontract with Election Management Consulting Services in the amount of \$51,051.26 for continued support on the Integrity system in the calendar year 2015.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Is there a second?

MS. MARINELLO: Second.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor say aye.

Opposed, say nay.

(Vote taken; motion passed.)

2.2

2.3

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Motion carries.

That's all that we have on this short agenda. We will be getting in touch with you guys in the next couple of weeks. As you all know, the deadline for candidate petitions is coming up this Wednesday, and so we're going to be in the business of validating those and then setting up the meetings so we can certify them to the ballot.

MR. HAAS: I'd like to raise two points because of the confusion over -- with the State Central Committee races in the democratic primary last year about petitions, and I just feel that for anybody who is taking a petition out, that they need to understand that the Board did not err in its decision initially about the petitions, that signatures have to match. They're required to.

It was in the process of the hearing that we obviously had an issue later. And I think it's very important for all -- everybody who has a petition out there to understand the rules, and, you know, for those to be reiterated for anybody who may have the wrong impression because of the Supreme Court decision. The Supreme Court decision was about

our post hearing, which is another issue that I think we should discuss.

2.2

2.3

But whether we are going to do that -- I mean, the reason to do that is so we don't end up in court, so if people are going to challenge us and we have to go to court anyhow, why are we basically pretending to be a judicial body and hearing challenges to our initial decision?

However, I mean, I think it's very important that everybody who is bringing a petition in here and filing it understands the signatures have to match what's on the voter registration card. And I'm just concerned, I don't want to go through that again, and I think there could be some people who misinterpret the whole legal challenge, they maybe misinterpret that we have more latitude, that we can be reckless with the petitions that we accept.

The rules are very clear and I really think it would be worth the director and deputy director to send a letter to everybody who is filing the petition to say, just so there is no misunderstanding about what happened last year, that was a decision about the process post filing, but the filings, what is considered a good signature is still

mandated by the Revised Code, and it's very clear.

2.2

2.3

There was ambiguity in our hearing afterwards, but there was no ambiguity in terms of the Board employees and the determination on the petitions in the first place, so I really think that everybody who is going to bring a petition in here needs to understand that.

MR. SINNOTT: When we pick up a petition or we download one online, are you seeing a set of instructions that say --

MR. HAAS: You can find them.

MR. SINNOTT: -- on each elector should sign using --

MR. HAAS: There was a gigantic misunderstanding about the one thing which we've all had over the years, about a signature matching. For instance, I've challenged this Board in the past about a signature matching because the signer may have a unique way of signing a particular letter in their name, you know. If they come in here and say that's how my A has always looked. That's how I know that is my signature, then you are kind of obligated if it does match to say that's the same person.

Somebody prints on the voter registration form then

signs in script on the petition, that's not a valid signature.

2.2

2.3

mean, I think that people who are circulating the petitions and the people signing those need to understand they need to tell people the signature has to match your voter registration card. That was not thrown out by the Supreme Court. That was not challenged by the Supreme Court. It was our process afterwards that was challenged.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: If what I'm hearing is correct, and we may need some legal verification, we have in the past allowed folks if there was some signature in question, that they could come back before this Board and argue that case before us, and that's where we got into that situation.

MR. HAAS: It cost money. I just believe we bent over backwards on that, and I don't think -- it's a legal issue at that point. We had done our job and made our determination based on what the Republicans and Democrats looked at on the petitions. We make our motion. At that point I would ask to call the Secretary of State's Office. Does every county have a hearing for challenges before the Board

13 1 for a signature count for petitions? 2 MS. FAULKNER: I'll ask. 3 MR. HAAS: I don't know, but I do know 4 I know we walked into -- by trying to do that, 5 we walked into a legal issue. 6 MR. SINNOTT: Yes, we did. 7 MR. HAAS: It was misinterpreted, and 8 it's like if this kind of thing is going to go to 9 court anyhow, why are we putting ourselves in a 10 position, as we did last year, of bending over 11 backwards for somebody and then it being 12 misconstrued? 13 So the two things would be to make sure 14 everybody who has a petition out there understands you got to follow the law. It's very simple. 15 16 signatures have to match. 17 The second thing I would say is if you 18 have a problem with our decision, take it to court. 19 DIRECTOR ANTHONY: Okay. 20 Yes. I think one of the MR. WALCH: 21 things, Mr. Haas, that happened with that -- and I 2.2 actually agree with everything you said here.

through the petition process, this Board does have to

there's a challenge to a signature that comes up

2.3

24

hear that --

2.2

2.3

2 MR. HAAS: Right.

MR. WALCH: -- to see if it is a

legitimate challenge. I think what we got caught up in the last time was offering the Board to appeal a

decision of the Board.

MR. HAAS: Right.

MR. WALCH: That's what happened to us last time. We had determined that that petition was insufficient but gave an appeal to that. Are you in agreement with that?

MR. HAAS: Total agreement. Somebody

comes in and says, yeah, I sometimes sign with a big

G and sometimes sign with a printed G on Gregory

Haas, but my two As are always the same. That's how

I know nobody forged my signature. So if you have --

MR. WALCH: We just had this training with everybody last week. We do this before every petition filing deadline with all the staff who will be checking the petitions. They are instructed to be lenient, but look for some similarities in there.

Not everybody does sign their signature exactly the same. I don't sign mine exactly the same every time, but you can look at my Ds or my Ws in my last name,

```
and usually those are always the same. As long as there is some commonality like that, usually that will qualify as a good signature.
```

2.2

2.3

MR. HAAS: But if it is too subtle for us to pick up, the person comes in. I think we had Dominic Parretti, who had a couple people who came in and said this is the way we do our As and whatever. I mean, we should hear that about whether is it a good signature.

But to get into the whole appeal of the decision process I just think, you know, I think we bent over backwards and we ended up actually looking like we --

MR. WALCH: We had egg on our face.

MR. HAAS: Yes.

DIRECTOR ANTHONY: So what would you like for us to do again?

MR. HAAS: Well, is it a motion?

Brad, what do you think?

MR. SINNOTT: We are on the record explaining here our concern. I can't think of any action the Board would take at this point that would be proper that would implement the sentiment that you just expressed.

```
1
                  MR. HAAS: I guess in terms of the
 2
      Secretary of State, I would like to understand what
 3
      other counties do.
 4
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: We can do that.
 5
                  MR. WALCH: We can definitely check that.
 6
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY:
                                     Yes.
 7
                  MR. HAAS: I would like us to avoid --
 8
                  MR. WALCH: I think Bill and I are in
 9
      agreement with that one for sure.
10
                  MR. HAAS: And the prosecutor.
11
                  MR. WALCH: And the prosecutor,
12
      absolutely.
13
                  MR. SINNOTT:
                               The next step is to get the
14
      report from the Secretary of State about what
15
      the process is if there is a situation similar to the
16
      Zach Scott matter, and at least the Central Ohio
17
      counties. I think you have that within your
18
      jurisdiction, right?
19
                  MS. FAULKNER: Yes.
20
                  MR. SINNOTT:
                               Okay.
21
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: We can do that.
2.2
                  MR. HAAS: The other thing, I guess, I
2.3
     would just like the director and deputy director to
24
     think about sending a letter out to everybody that
```

```
17
      requested a petition to reiterate the rules what is a
 1
 2
      legitimate signature.
 3
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All right.
                  MR. HAAS: If we have some close
 4
 5
      petitions and one or two that didn't match at all, we
 6
      are going to have chaos.
 7
                  MR. SINNOTT: All that being said, I move
 8
      we adjourn.
 9
                  MS. MARINELLO: I second that.
10
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: All those in favor.
11
                  (Vote taken; motion passed.)
12
                  DIRECTOR ANTHONY: We stand adjourned.
13
                  (The meeting adjourned at 3:47 p.m.)
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, February 2, 2015, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Rosemary Foster Anderson, Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio.

My commission expires April 5, 2019.

11 (RFA-77642)

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