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CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning and welcome. I hereby call to order the regular meeting of the Board of Elections for October 2014.

It is Wednesday, October 1st, 2014. The time is 10:41 a.m. We are meeting in Room 280 North of One Judiciary Square.

I am Deborah K. Nichols, Chairman of the Board. Present with me this morning eventually are -- Mr. Danzansky will be present. Also present this morning are Mr. Kenneth McGhie, the Board's General Counsel, Ms. Cecily Collier-Montgomery, the Board's Director of Campaign Finance and Mr. Clifford Tatum, the Board's Executive Director.

This morning, we're going to rearrange the agenda a little. We're going to move public matters up to number 4 which would be after Board matters. We're going to move the Office of Campaign Finance's report to...
after the Executive Director's report.

Okay. So, with that in mind --
and we're going to move adoption of the
minutes. There we go. Okay. We can do
business now. We'll maintain that order, but
yes, I'm going to keep it the same. I mean
leave it -- we'll leave it like it is and move
on.

So, without objection, the agenda
for this morning is adopted.

The minutes of the Board's meeting
of September the 10th, do you have any
corrections or amendments, Mr. Danzansky?

MEMBER DANZANSKY: No, Madam
Chair.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Well,
unless there are corrections we made or
technical corrections, the minutes of the
Regular Board Meeting of September 10th, 2014
are adopted.

Are there any Board matters that
Members wish to address in this public
meeting?

MEMBER DANZANSKY: None here.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right.

Mr. Executive Director, we'll now hear your report.

MR. TATUM: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just on the agenda for me today is to give an update on the status of November 4, the elections preparations.

As of today, we will begin the logic and accuracy testing of our M100s and iVotronics to insure their readiness for the election day voting.

Training, as indicated in a previous meeting, has begun and we are three weeks into training and we will have our first captains' training on this Saturday.

Election worker recruitment is going as scheduled. We are recruiting bilingual workers for both early voting and the election-day polling places. To date,
we've recruited and assigned over 1400 workers
to work on election day and we've got about
400 more that we need to assign, but we are in
good shape to meet our goal of 1800.

Outreach has begun. We have
proofed the Voter Guide and sent over to the
vendor for a production copy and once we get
that proofed, then we will schedule the
release of the Voter Guide on October the
10th.

We've started our election
promotional signs and PSAs and those will air,
I believe, within the next couple of weeks as
we get closer to the election.

Polling places, as you recall the
last meeting, we relocated -- proposed to
relocate five locations. Those notices have
been sent out to the registrar for
publication. We have not received any
responses back as of yet. So, at some point,
we will need to schedule a final meeting to
finalized those relocations.
The supply packing processes are in the way. We've -- as reported previously, we've revamped the packing process and we have different levels of inspection going on. So, we're comfortable that the supplies will be in for the precincts for election day.

And as for absentees, we've submitted -- we have distributed over 2500 absentee ballots to both domestic and military overseas voters and as applications are coming in, we're preparing absentees to go out.

So, that there concludes my report and if there's any questions.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Are there any questions of Mr. Tatum?

MEMBER DANZANSKY: No.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. We will now move to the report of General Counsel, Mr. McGhie.

MR. MCGHIE: Okay. The first thing I have on my agenda is the formulation of an initiative measure for the short title
and summary statement. The tentative name for the measure right now is "No Worker Shall Make Less Than The Minimum Wage Act of 2016."

The proposers of the initiative measure present?

MR. BERKON: Thank you.

MR. MCGHIE: Just to give a brief -- thank you. Please state your name and address for the record.

MS. ROTH: Stephanie Roth.

Address?

MR. MCGHIE: Yes.


MR. BERKON: And Jonathan Berkon. I work at Perkins Coie and our Perkins Coie is 700 13th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

MR. NUDELMAN: Dan Nudelman with Perkins Coie, 700 13th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

MR. MCGHIE: All right. Just to give a brief overview, your initiative measure
was approved by the Board as a proper subject for the initiative.

So, the next step under D.C. Code Section 1-1001.163 is for the Board to prepare a short title and summary statement of the measure. It has to be an impartial summary of what the measure does.

So, with that, Madam Chair.

CHAIR NICHOLS: The draft formulation has been prepared.

Do you want to read it into the record, Mr. McGhie or maybe we'll ask the proponents if they have any --

MR. MCGHIE: Well, I believe they do have a --

CHAIR NICHOLS: You had some suggested changes.

MR. BERKON: We only have one suggested change.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

MR. BERKON: In the fourth bullet point, it currently reads "Insure that the
minimum wage increases will not apply to D.C.
Government employees or employees of D.C.
Government contractors."

We would just suggest adding a
short phrase in the middle of it so that it
reads: "Insure that the minimum wage
increases not proscribed by current law will
not apply to D.C. Government employees or
employees of D.C. Government contractors."

And the reason for that is that
under the Minimum Wage Amendment Act of 2013
there already are certain increases that the
Council passed that are going into effect and
this initiative is not meant to affect those
at all.

MR. MCGHIE: Let me make sure I
have this right. So, with the fourth bullet
point, you want to say "Insure that the
minimum wage increases will not" --

MR. BERKON: Oh, sorry. "Insure
that the minimum wage increases not proscribed
by current law."
CHAIR NICHOLS: "Will not apply."

MR. MCGHIE: "Will not apply."

MR. BERKON: Yes.

MR. MCGHIE: Okay. And the rest remains?

MR. BERKON: And the rest remains.

MR. MCGHIE: Okay. With that,

I'll read the proposed initiative measure as

Initiative Measure Number 74. The short title

is "No Worker Shall Make Less Than The Minimum

Wage Act of 2016."

The summary statement reads: "If

enacted, the No Worker Shall Make Less Than

The Minimum Wage Act of 2016 will:

"Increase the minimum wage in the

District of Columbia to $15 hourly or $1 above

the Federal minimum wage whichever is greater

by 2019.

"Gradually increase the minimum

wage for tipped employees so that they receive

the same minimum wage as other employees by

2024."
"Beginning in 2020, require the minimum wage to increase yearly in proportion to increases in the consumer price index and insure that the minimum wage increases not proscribed by current law will not apply to D.C. Government employees or employees of D.C. Government contractors."

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. So, we will have to submit this to the Register. Four or five days -- for publication for five days from today.

Is that right?

MR. MCGHIE: Yes.

CHAIR NICHOLS: And so that any registered qualified elector in the District who objects to the summary statement can file comments.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: Do you need a motion to that effect, Madam Chair?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, please.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: Okay.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, yes.
MEMBER DANZANSKY: I move --

CHAIR NICHOLS: I need a motion to the effect that the Board adopts the summary title, summary statement and legislative form of the proposed initiative --

MEMBER DANZANSKY: And that were published --

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- as read by the --

MEMBER DANZANSKY: And were published --

CHAIR NICHOLS: And were published in the D.C. Register.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: I do so move.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Danzansky.

All in favor.

(Ayes.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: All opposed. Ayes have it.

Are there any questions? Are we coming to the end of --
MR. NUDELMAN: Yes, we're coming
to the end.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I mean I love
seeing you all. One more time. Thank you so
much.

MR. MCGHIE: So, in short, it's
too late for it to be in the D.C. Register
this Friday. So, we'll set it up and it will
be in the Register on the following Friday.

MR. BERKON: Excellent.

MR. MCGHIE: And this is a ten-day
period for challenge.

MS. ROTH: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thank
you all. Thank you for your patience.

All right. Mr. McGhie.

MR. MCGHIE: Next, I have final
rulemaking. This is to amend Chapter 12 to
determine the order of contests and questions
on the primary, general and special election
ballot. It's simply to position the Office of
the Attorney General to add it to the list of
contests and the 30-day comment period has expired. There were no comments received.

So, now I'm requesting the Board entertain a motion to adopt this as final rulemaking.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. I will entertain that motion.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: Okay. Madam Chair, I move that the amendment to 3 DCMR Section 1202 "Order of Contests" be adopted by the Board as final movement.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. The motion is before us. All in favor.

(Ayes.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: All opposed. Ayes have it.

Mr. McGhie.

MR. MCGHIE: Okay. The only thing left is the litigation status update. The first one is Cheeks v. the Board of Elections and Ethics. This was a petition for review that was filed by Mr. Cheeks to his — a challenge to his nominating petition. Mr.
Cheeks was eventually allowed to be placed on the ballot. So, he withdrew his complaint.

The next one is Foshager v. the D.C. Board of Elections and Ethics. This again was a complaint to the nominating petition for Nestor Djonkam for Mayor. Mr. Foshager filed a petition for review challenging the Board's determination that Mr. Djonkam should be placed on the ballot and the Court of Appeals -- well, I would say he filed it in Superior Court. Yes, and so, the Superior Court threw it out because it was not the proper place for it to be filed.

The next one is Sewell v. the D.C. Board. This was a complaint. It was a rather strange complaint. It was for harassment. He filed a complaint against the Office of Campaign Finance, the Board of Elections and the District of Columbia Government saying that we were harassing him. He filed it in D.C. Superior Court and we filed a -- I just believe a motion to dismiss on that and that
might be pending.

And then the last one is McMillan versus the Board of Elections and Ethics. You're familiar with that one. That was the one that was filed for the rent is too damn high. The Board filed a motion to dismiss on that because Mr. McMillan is not even a resident of the District of Columbia. He's a resident of New York and no decision has been made on that as of yet.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Thank you, Mr. McGhie.

We will now move to the report of the Board's Director of Campaign Finance Ms. Collier-Montgomery.

MS. COLLIER-MONTGOMERY: Yes.

Good morning.

The first thing that I would like to bring to the attention of the members of the public is that the Office of Campaign Finance has introduced at its website summary reports of the contributions and expenditures
in the Constituent Service Programs by donor
type/amount as well as by purpose with graphs.

And so, basically, what happens is
that after the constituent service reports,
financial reports are filed with the Office of
Campaign Finance, summary reports of the
information that's contained in those reports
is pulled together and is broken down by
contribution and by expenditure and there are
tables which are also made available in the
reports which show the breakdown by dollar
amount, contributor type as well as by
expenditure by purpose and so, those are
available at our website.

The other thing is that the Office
of Campaign Finance and the Office of the
General Counsel have been working on the
revision of our rules, a complete overhaul of
the regulation, so that we will be prepared to
fully implement the provisions of D.C. Law -
79. Which is the Campaign Finance Reform and
Transparency Act of 2013 and those provisions
will become applicable as of January 31st, 2015.

And those provisions will require amongst other things the mandatory electronic filing of financial reports with the Office of Campaign Finance as well as mandatory training of all new candidates and treasurers of the various political committees. Also, the Independent Expenditure Committee and our Political Action Committee.

It will also require the inclusion of business contributor information in the financial reports that are filed with us.

So, there's a lot of changes that will be required in the campaign finance laws. So, we're trying to take steps now to prepare for that.

During the month of September on September the 10th, 2014, the Report of Receipts and Expenditures was due by the initiative's referendum and recall measures.

On September the 10th, we had five
required filers and those were all initiative committees. The filers all timely filed.

Also, four of the committees used the electronic filing system and also certified their e-filings.

With respect to the new candidates and the committees who registered to participate in the 2014 election cycle, during the month of September: Preston Cornish, City Council from Ward 5 registered on September the 15th, 2014; Kyle Walker, City Council for Chair registered on September the 22nd, 2014; John LaBeaume/LaBeaume 2014 registered as a candidate for the Council from Ward 1 on September the 22nd, 2014 and the Initiative Committee No on 71 registered on September the 23rd, 2014.

The entrance conferences for these committees will be held in September and that date is to be determined.

In our Reports, Analysis and Audit Division during the month of September, the
Audit Division completed 51 desk reviews of the filings of our committees.

Also, in the Audit Branch, with respect to ongoing audits with the full-field audits, we have one Gray for Mayor.

With periodic random audits of candidates registered for the upcoming election 2014, the following are ongoing:

Bowser for Mayor, Wells for Mayor, Evans for Mayor, Charles Allen for Ward 6, Catania for Mayor, Friends of Courtney R. Snowden, Elect Cheeks for Chairman.

With the periodic random audits of our continuing committees and these are with respect to reports which were filed on July the 31, 2014, we have two: Biddle 2012 and Hubbard for Ward 5 - 2012.

We did not issue any audits during the month of September, but as the audits are issued, they are available at our website for members of the public.

And I would ask Mr. Sanford to
give the report of the General Counsel for the Office of Campaign Finance.

MR. SANFORD: Good morning, Madam Chair and distinguished Board Member Danzansky.

My name is William Sanford, General Counsel for the Office of Campaign Finance.

During the month of September 2014, the Office of the General Counsel received four referrals which all were referred by the Reports, Analysis and Audit Division and they consisted of three referrals of principal campaign committees and one referral of a political action committee.

The Office of the General Counsel issued 14 orders which included the following: Eight orders for failure to timely file in which no fines were imposed, five orders for failure to timely file in which a total of $6,150 in files were imposed and one order regarding failure to timely respond to a
request for additional information in which no fine was imposed.

The fines that were imposed during the month of September were the following:

- $1,350 for failure to timely file against Winifred Carson-Smith a candidate for the Democratic National Committee,
- $1,350 failure to timely file against Christian Carter a candidate for the At-Large position on the District of Columbia's Council,
- $900 against Darrell Gaston failure to timely file a candidate for the Ward 8 School Board position,
- $1,350 for failure to timely file against Martin Sterbal a candidate for the U.S. Senate and $1,200 against the Youth Action PAC for failure to timely file.

And all of these committees failed to timely file August 10th reports.

During the month of September, there were no requests for interpretive opinions and no show cause proceedings were conducted.
The Office of the General Counsel maintained a docket of seven open investigations during that month and there were no new investigations opened during the month of September and that should conclude my report.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Sanford.

Mr. Danzansky, do you have any questions of Mr. Sanford or Ms. Collier-Montgomery?

MEMBER DANZANSKY: No questions, Madam Chair.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Now, we will move to public matters. Are there any public matters to come before us? Let me -- come forward and then we'll get you, Mr. Turner. All right.

Come forward, sir, and --

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- give us your name for the record.
MR. SULLIVAN: Sure. My name is Charles Sullivan and I direct CURE and I have a handout if I could share with the --

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right.

MR. SULLIVAN: Two sheets.

CHAIR NICHOLS: We could get staff to -- sir, have a seat.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Madam Chair and Commission, I'm with an organization. As you know, I've been here before. Concern -- it's a prison reform organization concerned with voting in the two jails.

And so, we are approaching the City Council to have this proposal which is the Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2014 and what we say first of all, we do not have any concern with registering. The first step in regard to people in the jail. The City Council passed legislation that says that when a person is processed in the jail, they're given an opportunity to register and vote.

But, our problem and concern is
being able to vote absentee and presently, Mr. Tatum and the Board of Elections and the Department of Corrections, too, I think are very -- they're very committed to -- doing a very good job for doing this.

The problem is it just seems like structurally we're just not getting the number of votes. I don't know what the statistics showed last time, but we're averaging in two jails that could have 2,000 to maybe 2300 or 2400 people incarcerated about 100 votes. Pretty much is what comes out of it.

And so, what we are suggesting as a remedy that the jail be -- the two jails together be made a early voting site. Which would provide a much longer time for people in the jail to be educated. I think the biggest problem that is the deterrent for people voting in the jail is they don't understand what is going on and having -- it would be a voting -- early voting site which would be a much longer time and then it would be an
opportunity to educate people.

We're talking about -- even though 2300 people may be in the jail at any one time, these are dynamic figures. You've got people going in and out of jail all the time even during the two weeks that the early voting would be going on. Every -- there's a one week. Whatever it is. But, there would be an opportunity to educate.

I think one of the big problems is when people register to vote they might say I want to be an independent voter, but if they vote, if they register independent, they're not going to vote in the Democratic Primary. I mean, you know, there's just basic things that people don't know.

And it gives them an opportunity to really become civic minded and we know, I think, statistically if they're civic minded you're going to have an investment in society and there's going to be less crime. So, I think it -- that -- I think we're at this
point.

Now, I would -- we now have early voting experience what four or five years. I guess Mr. Tatum could tell, but we do have experience now and this would not be that big a leap to make the jail an early voting site just for the prisoners in the two jails and it would also go all the way until the end of the voting day. You couldn't close it on Friday because you still got people being processed in the jail. In fact, it could be a lot of people processed in the jail if you look at -- it could be -- over a weekend, there's probably a hundred or so people processed into the jail. So, if they wanted to vote.

And also, you would have under early voting where they would be able to register the very day that they vote. Which is given to everybody else in the early voting. This would also be an opportunity for people to register and to vote if they're qualified on that very same day.
And then the great leap forward is something that I don't think is necessarily a leap, but we know that there are two states, Vermont and Maine, that allow all prisoners to vote and this would be an opportunity.

This is -- I think, people are afraid to register. They figure well, I'm in trouble now. I don't want to make a mistake and so, because of that, they don't register.

Also, I think there are many bilingual people. I've talked to Ms. Garcia about this. She's never had yet someone ask to speak in Spanish in all the years that they've been going in and that says there are a lot of people that would be much more comfortable in Spanish if they were given a much longer time.

And also, that there would be no limitation in regard -- right now, you cannot vote in D.C. if you were serving a felony and so, this would eliminate that and I think we would get a lot more votes.
So, I remember my wife when she brought back a -- before, you know, we used to have volunteers that would do this, but we concluded the problem is that if the volunteers disappeared this would end up not happening any more.

So, what has happened is the Board of Elections which has done a wonderful job trying to reach out, but I think they could tell you that when they bring back those absentee ballots, they find that people are in court. You know, if they were in court, then if you had a longer time. Say on Tuesday, they're in court. On Wednesday, maybe they could vote if it's a much longer time.

So, it seems like we would be able to build up a much bigger number than we're doing now.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Sounds very interesting. So.

MR. SULLIVAN: And so -- and then like I say, another thing, when we were
bringing them back -- I was going to just
share this one story. When we were bringing
them back, my wife was one of the volunteers
and the individual said oh, I wish you had
come earlier. I just got my felony conviction
from the court. Which meant that he couldn't
vote. See. And he had also registered to
vote.

I mean it gets very complicated.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, I was
asking --

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I thought it was
even though you're convicted of a felony, your
rights weren't suspended until you began to
serve your term. But, he's telling me that's
not --

MR. SULLIVAN: No, when you're
convicted -- and there are people waiting in
the jail --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- to be taken into
the Federal system.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: And they may have registered because they were awaiting trial at one point and then they've got that conviction and then they didn't -- you know, then they --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Right.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- didn't vote.

It's confusing. This would eliminate I think the confusion in regard to -- and we would joining two states, Vermont and Maine, that actually do this where everybody has an opportunity to vote. There's no distinction made.

And it would be also with prisoners that are sent into the Federal system. It would be a tie-in to be able to tie-in. Because they're going to return to D.C.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: Mr. Sullivan, not to cut you off, but is this informational for us or is there some action?
MR. SULLIVAN: Well, we have approached Mr. McDuffie's office.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: So --

MEMBER DANZANSKY: So, this is -- all of this is incorporated in your amendments. Correct?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Right.

Right.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: Okay. And you're just informing us.

MR. SULLIVAN: Right. We just wanted to let you know.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

MEMBER DANZANSKY: I just wanted to make -- just --

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Thank you.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan.

Are there any questions?
Thank you, sir.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, ma'am.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good to see you as always.

All right. Mr. Turner, come forward.

MR. TURNER: Good morning, Madam Chair, Mr. Danzansky.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning.

MR. TURNER: My name is Robert Turner with the D.C. Republican Party.

Since we're on the topic of absentee voting, I just wanted to alert the Board that the Republican Party once again will be initiating an absentee ballot program exactly as we did in 2013 during the special election.

Well, we will send registered Republican voters preprinted absentee ballots with every information except signature, date of birth and Social Security number. They will have to fill that out themselves and
return it to the Board with a --

MR. MCGHIE: Preprinted absentee ballot request.


And I pull up the example of what we did last time for your review.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. TURNER: And we'd like to renew our request for daily reports of who requested an absentee ballot and the last time, you said it was -- you had an issue with the timing of our request. So, I wanted to try to get that in a little bit earlier this time around.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. All right. And we'll get back to you on that.

MR. TURNER: Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, sir.

Wait. Did you have any questions?

MEMBER DANZANSKY: No, thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Thank
you, Mr. Turner.

    MR. TURNER: Thank you.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Are there any more public concerns?

    There being no business -- no further business before us, this meeting is adjourned. The time is 11:15 a.m. It's still Wednesday, October 1st, 2014.

    (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:15 a.m.)
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