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CHAIR BENNETT: (Presiding) I'd like to call the meeting to order. This is the meeting of the D.C. Board of Elections for October. It is 10:55, and I'd like to call the meeting to order.

First, I would like to introduce the persons here at the dais. To my left is Ms. Alice Miller, Executive Director of the Board of Elections. To my far right is Mr. William Sanford, who is sitting in, who is General Counsel of the Office of Campaign Finance, who is sitting in for Ms. Cecily Montgomery who is out ill. To his left is Terri Stroud, General Counsel, Board of Elections. To her left, my right, Board Member Mr. Michael Gill, and I'm Michael Bennett, Chair of the Board.

So, we have a quorum. It takes two of the three-person Board to have a quorum. Mr. Gill and myself right here have the quorum.

The first thing I would like to do is
to adopt the minutes from the September 5th meeting. I think we've both had an opportunity to review those minutes.

Can I get a motion, Mr. Gill, for acceptance of the minutes?

MEMBER GILL: Motion to adopt the meeting minutes from September 5th, and I think we need a motion to adopt the agenda.

CHAIR BENNETT: Oh, I'm sorry, yes.

MEMBER GILL: Do them both.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. So, both have been properly moved, to adopt the agenda for this meeting and, also, to adopt the minutes from the previous Board meeting from September. So, that's been properly moved. I second. And so, with that, we have unanimous adoption of both the agenda and the minutes from the previous meeting.

Can you hear us okay, Reporter? Can you hear us okay?

COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. Great. Thanks.

Any Board matters, Mr. Gill?
MEMBER GILL: So, I did not want to indulge the Board for a couple of questions for Terri. I had the opportunity to be, a request to sign a recall petition, which in my prior position I chose not to participate in. But it occurred to me that we have two separate recall petitions currently circulating for signatures. And I wanted to just run through a couple of scenarios with our General Counsel.

MS. STROUD: Okay.

MEMBER GILL: So, we need a percentage of the registered voters. And so, let's just say, for an example, say that you need 5,000 signatures to qualify on the ballot.

MS. STROUD: Okay.

MEMBER GILL: Scenario 1: both petitions get 4900 unique signatures with no overlap whatsoever. Do we have an election?

MS. STROUD: We do not because, for recall petitions, you need 10 percent of the registered qualified electors that reside in that particular jurisdiction. So, if that number
happens to be 5,000 and they don't submit 5,000, then neither one of them would be accepted because they wouldn't have the minimum number of signatures required in order to proceed.

MEMBER GILL: Even though by combining them -- and many people would say it's the same exact question -- even though by combining them, they would still both fall through, fall below the threshold?

MS. STROUD: No. Each of the individual --

MEMBER GILL: Because we can't combine them?

MS. STROUD: We can't combine them. Each individual recall petition is a unique effort, and you wouldn't be able to combine the signatures from both efforts if it were to have them attain the minimum number of signatures required for ballot access. You couldn't combine two separate petition measures, what we call petition measures.

MEMBER GILL: Right. And then, so in
the situation where one of the efforts perhaps
gets the requisite amount, but a sufficient
number have been challenged, such that they fall
below that amount, again, they're in the same
position? They can't go and take unique
signatures from the other petition?

MS. STROUD: No, they cannot.

MEMBER GILL: Okay. So, I know that
that's sort of -- we knew that, but what I wanted
to reflect was that I want to prevent the
situation where, suddenly, the Board is thrust to
somehow thwart democracy by keeping a recall
petition off the ballot in such a situation. And
so, just for the record, organizers chose to have
two separate petitions.

MS. STROUD: That is correct. That is
correct.

MEMBER GILL: I observed during the
process leading up to this that one of the
organizers had some residency questions, and I
sort of observed, my goodness, couldn't we just
find someone who didn't have residency questions,
and then, the Board would have an easier
decision. I was persuaded by that particular
petitioner that that person has a right, just
like anyone else, and it's actually a difficult
process and you kind of -- you know, it's not
something to be taken lightly. And there's a
certain organization that has to grow up around
this. And so, I was persuaded that, you know
what, the witness was correct; we shouldn't; if
he has the proper residency, then that's all
there is and such like.

I only wish that the others had been
persuaded because now we do have two recall
petitions circulating for the same exact outcome.
If neither one of them gets the requisite amount,
but together both do, our hands are tied and
there's nothing we can do because we will follow
the regulations as they are.

MS. STROUD: Exactly.

MEMBER GILL: All right.

MS. STROUD: The statute and the
regulations do not allow for combining separate
recall petition measures, though they might be
toward the same end, yet, each an individual
effort, and they must stand or fall on their own,
pursuant to the statute and the regulations.

MEMBER GILL: I see.

CHAIR BENNETT: The other thing, just
to kind of throw my thought in, is that -- and
I'm not sure what the rationale for that in terms
of keeping things separate relative to the law
and the regs. However, one thing I could see
being a problem is that, if you've got two
different petitions, which we do have, they could
potentially end up having significant overlap in
terms of people, the person signing. And I would
imagine that's pretty likely since this is all in
one Ward. So, you could potentially end up
combining those two petitions and end up with
lots and lots of duplication relative to the
signatures, which would require just a lot of
administrative work to try to figure that out.

MEMBER GILL: I hadn't even
contemplated that.
CHAIR BENNETT: Right.

MS. STROUD: They are both subjected to the same petition verification process, and citizens aren't precluded from signing --

CHAIR BENNETT: Oh, I understand, but my point is, if you combine both, if you combine them, then you could end up having a lot of overlap --

MS. STROUD: Okay.

CHAIR BENNETT: -- which means that we would end up having to, like having the responsibility, like the administrative responsibility for determining what that overlap is, so you didn't count the same signature twice.

MS. STROUD: Exactly.

CHAIR BENNETT: So, that's one of the things that I would see just as an administrative challenge. It would make sense, though, if those persons that had those two petitions joined forces and just focused on one. But there also could be two separate agendas in that regard.

But I appreciate your point and it
does make a lot of sense, but the administrative matters could get to be, I think, a little more complex when you get down to the verification of stuff. But that's just a comment, not a point or a position.

Any other Board matters, Mr. Gill?

MEMBER GILL: No.

CHAIR BENNETT: I had another Board matter that I wanted to address. That is I wanted to recognize Dionna Lewis, our former Board Member, who is close to being here. And I'll start talking about it before she gets in the room. She's parking now. So, she should be here in a second.

But one of the things I wanted to -- well, I'll wait to talk to her when she's here. You know, I shouldn't say anything bad or good about somebody if they're not here, in your presence.

(Laughter.)

So, I'll wait on that.

So, what I'll do is I'll come back to
Board matters, and I'm going to ask if there are any public matters that need to be identified at this point that we can address later on in the agenda on the public matters.

Yes, ma'am? You may approach.

MS. BRIZILL: Good morning. My name is Dorothy Brizill. I'm the Executive Director of DC Watch. The address is 1327 Girard Street, Northwest. I would like to raise several matters with the Board and, hopefully, get some clarification or information on those matters.

First and foremost, I'd like to get some information regarding the Board's preparation for the 2020 election. I specifically note in the minutes of the September 5th meeting that you approved there are a number of matters that are raised. And one, in particular, I am concerned about, and that's the last bullet point in the minutes summary in which Mr. Bennett indicated that the Board's voting machines are closed, not connected to the internet. I would like clarification for that
because I do not believe that is true.

The other thing that Mr. Bennett goes on to say, the Board uses all paper ballots. And again, I believe that that is not a complete and truthful statement.

I have a number of questions I'd like to get clarification regarding preparation for the 2020 elections. I have questions regarding election security, and especially any potential foreign influence through social media on our election. I'd like to know what preparation is being made with that regard.

I'd like to know whether or not any Board of Elections officials have secured high-level clearance from the U.S. Government, so that they can receive and be recipients of any information regarding threats to our elections process.

I would like information regarding the security and operation of our voting machines and our mainframe computers.

I would like information regarding the
training of poll workers regarding election security.

And I'd like information regarding the IT expertise of the Board of Elections going into the 2020 elections.

Finally, with regard to the 2020 election, I'd like information regarding whether or not the Board of Elections since the last election has received federal funds. Did you receive any federal funds in 2018, 2019, or are you anticipating receiving any federal funds in 2020, given the recent Senate action on election voting systems for the 2020 election? And if you are receiving those funds, from what federal entity will you be receiving it? Will it be from the Federal Election Assistance Commission?

With regard to the Office of Campaign Finance, I'd like clarification regarding litigation status against the Office of Campaign Finance. Are there any pending lawsuits against the Office of Campaign Finance? And clarification and information regarding any
recently-settled lawsuits against the Office of Campaign Finance.

And with regards to the Office of Campaign Finance, I'd like some clarification regarding a recent hire in that office in the Fair Elections Program. I understand you recently hired an attorney. I'd like to know that person's qualifications and preparation to administer the Federal Elections Program we enacted in the District of Columbia.

And finally, back to the Board of Elections, I'd like to know, have answers to a question regarding Ken McGhie. What is his current position at the Board? I understand he's currently still coming to work. What is his position and his pay grade?

Thank you.

CHAIR BENNETT: Thank you.

Any other matters that we need to consider and address later from the public?

MR. SINDRAN: Yes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR BENNETT: Yes, sir?
MR. SINDRAN: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR BENNETT: Yes, sir?

MR. SINDRAN: Michael Sindran, disabled veteran, served our country more than most. Good morning.

My question is -- and I waded in a little bit not too long ago -- talking about dual-circulation petitions recall.

Presumptively, that attaches to Jack Evans or to --

MEMBER GILL: Yes. Yes, that's what we're talking about.

MR. SINDRAN: Okay. All right. So, my question/concern is this: With the duplicative recall, if I understand what was said, it is one can nullify the other, which blows the whole issue out of the water. So, on your end administrative or in the law, is there something where a petition, if it's filed initially first, is giving the nod, as opposed to multiple petitions which can nullify the objectives sought? Because as it stands right
now, the way I understand it is two of them are counteracting one another. And so, we're going nowhere quick.

MEMBER GILL: So, Michael, just a bit of miscommunication there. They don't nullify each other. We could easily have a situation where both petitions garner the requisite amount and both petitions are certified as, okay, you've met the amount. The question there would be, you don't put the actual full petition on the ballot. You simply put the question on the ballot. And so, if both petitions qualified, then there would be on the ballot one question, and that is whether to recall the Board Member or not. So, they're not competing against each other.

The only thing I wanted to get into the minutes was, it takes an effort to raise these signatures, and if you've got two groups doing the same thing, they may think, because there's this groundswell of signatures, that surely there's enough in there. But if both don't get to the amount individually, they can't
combine. And that's all I wanted to get clear, because I didn't want us to be in a position of being told that, because the two petitions together got the requisite amount, that we have to put it on the ballot. That's not the way the regulations read, and each stands on its own. So, that's all we wanted to get clear.

MR. SINDRAN: Yes, excellent point. Thank you for that clarification.

So, then, to follow up, what can be done at your end or with the Council or in law, so that the efforts are not duplicative and that -- I believe you used the term, or someone did -- overlapping signatures, so they're not counted twice? So, the danger and the point is, and the concern or real concern is, that the number is not met. However, if they were combined, the different signatures, then they would rise; then it would qualify.

So, is there a mechanism in place to come and let us reason together, to bring the various folks that are at the head of the
petition to say, look, you're duplicating this
cause and you're counteracting and nullifying,
and what about uniting and getting one?

CHAIR BENNETT: Mr. Sindran, we will
note the question and, if you don't mind, I'll
allow you to bring that up again at a later point
in the agenda, once we get to the discussion of
public matters. We just wanted to identify
those, and we appreciate your identifying them,
the ones that you have.

MR. SINDRAN: Very good.

CHAIR BENNETT: Is there anything else
that you have to identify?

MR. SINDRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

No.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. Great. Thank
you.

Any other public matters we would like
to identify?

(No response.)

Great. Well, then, I'm going to go
back to Board matters. And the one Board matter
we have that we wanted to take the time to consider or to address is to recognize and appreciate a former Board Member. It seems weird to say "former Board Member" to Dionna Lewis, who served with distinction and with brilliance and with commitment. I wanted to take the time to recognize her and to present her something. But I also wanted to give everybody here an opportunity to say a couple of things about you. And I'll close out and give you the recognition.

But, just on a personal basis, it has been a great pleasure for me to be able to have the chance to work with you. You certainly are one of the bright minds in our community, young bright minds in our community now, and you've applied that with just incredible ability just for the Board. The times that we've had difficult issues to deal with, your input has just been invaluable to the whole Board, and certainly to me on a personal basis as Chair. So, I thank you.

Your new Board service that you had to
give up this one to engage will benefit greatly
from your expertise and from your
professionalism. So, our loss is certainly their
gain and the gain of the city going forward. So,
thank you for your service.

Mr. Gill?

MEMBER GILL: Mr. Chairman, I echo
your remarks.

Dionna, such a great pleasure to have
met you and had this opportunity to work with
you. I appreciate your commitment to this city.
You are passionate about the city. I appreciate
your legal mind. You brought a lot of legal
firepower into your meetings after the hearings
to sort of parse through a lot of these things.

So, I just want to say it's really
great to serve on this Board and get to do a
little bit of work for the city, but really the
honor has been to meet great people like
yourself. It is a pleasure to have had you for a
colleague, and it's an honor to call you a
friend.
CHAIR BENNETT: Great.

Ms. Miller?

MS. MILLER: Thank you.

I have probably known Dionna longer than most on here. I've known Dionna since she was a rising collegiate at the University of Virginia with my son. And I watched her in that capacity take on many, many challenges with the University, and even take on the President of the University. I can say she doesn't remember this --

CHAIR BENNETT: I'm shocked.

(Laughter.)

MS. MILLER: She did not step down, made it quite clear that some of the racial matters that they were facing were totally unacceptable. And in fact, because of her and others, with her guidance, there were some things put in place at the University during that time that address problems.

So, I will say I'm not at all surprised at her onward/upward kind of mobility.
As I said, I've watched her for a long time, and we will miss you sincerely. I know you'll go on to great and wonderful things, just from what I've seen from you as, I would say, an 18-year-old to now. So, we'll miss you, but congratulations.

CHAIR BENNETT: Ms. Stroud?

MS. STROUD: Hi, Dionna. I just think you're simply brilliant. I think the sentiment that comes to my mind when I think of you is the sentiment that someone expressed in support of you very recently, and I thought it was totally accurate. And that comment was, "She measures twice and cuts once." You are very surgical in your skill and you're precise. There's no filler with you; there's no fluff. You are a model of an attorney of any age.

And it's a pleasure to work with you. I learned a lot from you, from watching you, your poise in the face of ridiculousness sometimes. And so, I'm honored to have met you, to have worked with you, and I just think you're
brilliant and awesome.

CHAIR BENNETT: Mr. Sanford?

MR. SANFORD: At times like this I wish I had gone first because of all the good things people have said.

(Laughter.)

So, I will just say that I agree with everything that has been said about the eminent Ms. Lewis, who is a great attorney, a great legal mind, and was a fantastic Board Member. It's been an honor and privilege to work with you.

CHAIR BENNETT: Great. So, we're going to come around now, and Mr. Budoo is going to take a picture. Thank you.

And we're going to present. We've got your nameplates, too, that you can have.

Come on up. Come on up.

MS. LEWIS: Good morning. My name is Dionna Maria Lewis. I'm a resident of Ward 7. My physical, and where I lay my head, address is 3958 Blaine Street, Northeast, Washington, D.C. 20019.
Thank you all so much for these kind remarks. I really appreciate it. I mean, it's so nostalgic just coming here, coming to the parking lot on the first Wednesday of the month. And it's really bittersweet, quite frankly. I mean, I look to you all as family. You know, I love you. Mike and Michael, I look to you all as like uncles. Alice is like the sister I never had, and so is Terri and Bill; you're the same -- not sister, of course -- brother.

(Laughter.)

But I really appreciate just working with you all. I appreciate the familial relationships and collegial relationships that we've had, and that I expect we will continue to have because I genuinely look at all of you as lifelong friends, I mean including Cecily. You know, I actually went to high school with Cecily's daughter. I mean, it's like zero degrees of separation here.

And I'm just really honored to have had this opportunity.
CHAIR BENNETT: And my son, right?

MS. LEWIS: Yes. Yes, and your son.

Look at that. That's right. That's right.

You know, I'm just really honored to have had this privilege. It really is a privilege. It's a privilege to see the work that the Members and the staff at BOE do every day to ensure that voters are enfranchised. I mean, it's a privilege to be on a Board, or to have been on a Board, with such esteemed people like yourselves who are pushing forward this often thankless work.

A lot of people don't really know just how much work goes into the Board of Elections, how much work goes into an election. And sometimes all they see is the output, right, and they don't really know the 24-hour nights where people have been working non-stop with no sleep. They don't know the weekend hours where there's no additional pay or things like that.

So, I'm just really honored and very happy, quite frankly. This has really been a
pleasure, one of my like more pleasurable
chapters of my life. I'm, of course, very
grateful for the opportunity, the new opportunity
at OEA. But you all, always and forever, have a
very, very special place in my heart. I'm trying
not to get teary-eyed.

CHAIR BENNETT: And we love you.

MS. LEWIS: I will miss you all very
much.

CHAIR BENNETT: We'll miss you, too.

We miss Royal, too.

(Laughter.)

Why didn't you bring her today?

MS. LEWIS: She's a teenager now.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. Let's go
around.

(Applause.)

MS. LEWIS: Thank you.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay, on to the next
matter. That's Office of Campaign Finance
Report. Ms. Cecily Montgomery, as I said, is not
here. General Counsel Sanford is going to provide that report, along with the General Counsel's Report for the Office of Campaign Finance.

Mr. Sanford?

MR. SANFORD: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and distinguished Board Member Gill. I'm William Sanford, General Counsel for the Office of Campaign Finance, appearing on behalf of Cecily Collier-Montgomery, the Director.

We are pleased to report that, during month of September, the Fair Elections Program grew to 14 registered candidates, and they include the following:

On Wednesday, September 11th, the 11th candidate, the Committee to Elect Taurus Phillips registered with the Office of Campaign Finance.

On Thursday, September 12th, the 12th candidate under the Fair Elections Program, Yilin Zhang from Ward 2 registered with the Office of Campaign Finance.

On Friday, September 13th, the 13th
candidate in the Fair Elections Program, Markus
for DC Council At-Large registered with the
Office of Campaign Finance.
And on Thursday, September 19th, the
14th candidate, Boston for State Board of
Education, registered with the Fair Elections
Program.
During the month of September 2019,
two candidates were certified in the Fair
Elections Program, and they include:
John Fanning. John Fanning was
certified after submitting 163 contributions that
total 6,390, which is beyond the requirement of
150 contributions with a total of $5,000.
Also certified under the Fair
Elections Program in September was Janeese Lewis
George, and she was certified after submitting
proof of 307 contributions that totaled $12,290.
On September 12th, 2019, John Fanning,
John Fanning for Ward 2, candidate was certified
for participating in the Fair Elections Program.
And Mr. Fanning will receive a payout amount of
$31,000 in matching funds and $20,000 in the base amount.

On September 17th, Candidate Janeese Lewis George, who is a candidate for City Council in Ward 4, was certified participating in Fair Elections Program. And Ms. George will receive a total of $61,450 in matching funds and $20,000 in the base amount.

On September 3rd, the Fair Elections staff participated in outreach at ANC 4A02 at the Metropolitan Police Department for the District at 6001 Georgia Avenue.

On September 4th, the Fair Elections staff participated in outreach at ANC 3D at the Wesley Theological Seminary at 4500 Massachusetts Avenue, Northwest.

And on September 14th, the Fair Elections staff participated in a forum for DC Women in Politics at the Greater Washington Urban League Building, 14th Street, Northwest.

The following stats are the statistics for the Public Information and Records Management
Division during the month of September. During the month of September, new candidates were registered, including:

Veda Rasheed for Ward 2, City Council, who registered on the 9th of September;

Taurus Phillips, Committee to Elect Taurus Phillips, City Council, Ward 8, under the Fair Elections Program, registered on September 11th, 2019;

Yilin Zhang, Yilin Zhang for Ward 2, City Council, under the Fair Elections Program, registered on September 12, 2019;

Markus Batchelor, Markus for DC City Council At-Large, under the Fair Elections Program, registered on the 13th of September;

Charles Boston for the State Board of Education for Ward 7 registered under the Fair Elections Program on the 19th of September;

And the D.C. Legal Defense Committee for Jack Evans registered on September 23rd, 2019.

The Office of Campaign Finance
conducted two entrance conferences. The first entrance conference was conducted on September 11th, a single participant, Mr. Taurus Phillips, a candidate under the Fair Elections Program from Ward 8, Council.

And the second entrance conference was conducted on the 25th of September and the following candidates and committees participated:

Charles Boston, candidate for State Board of Education; Robert Lee, candidate for City Council, Ward 2; Leola Jenkins, Treasurer, D.C. Political Action Candidate Election; Robert White, candidate for Friends of Robert White, candidate for At-Large Council; Veda Rasheed, candidate for Ward 7; Sean Watson, Treasurer, Veda Rasheed, and Donald Dinan, Treasurer for D.C. Legal Defense Committee for Jack Evans.

During the month --

CHAIR BENNETT: Mr. Sanford, I'm sorry.

MR. SANFORD: Sure.

CHAIR BENNETT: I think you just
corrected it, but Veda Rasheed is corrected as Ward 7, not Ward 2. I think you misstated earlier that it was Ward 2, not Ward 7.

MR. SANFORD: She's with Ward 7.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR. SANFORD: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

During the month of September, the Reports Analysis and Audit Division conducted the following activity:

They reviewed reports from five Political Action Committees.

They reviewed reports and amended reports from 16 principal campaign committees.

They issued 19 audit letters or requests for additional information.

They resolved nine cases, referred five cases to the Office of the General Counsel.

The Reports Analysis and Audit Division terminated 15 cases.

They conducted three in-house training
seminars and attended and participated in two entrance conferences.

The Reports Analysis and Audit Division is engaged in the following activity as well:

Two full field audits which include:

The Committee to Elect Zachary Parker, which was a campaign in 2019, and that audit was commenced on March 5th, 2019.

Emily for Education, and that audit was commenced on March 4th of 2019.

The Office also engaged in three random audits which include: Reelect Brandon Todd 2020. That audit was initiated on September 4th, 2019. The Gertrude Stein Political Action Committee, and the DC Democratic State Committee. That audit was initiated on September 10th, 2019.

During the month of September, the Office of the General Counsel received five referrals from the Reports Analysis and Audit Division. The Office of General Counsel completed 11 informal hearings and issued 11
orders, which include the following:

One order for failure to timely file an ANC Summary Financial Report Order in which the Notice of Hearing and Statement of Violation was vacated, was issued. Six orders regarding failure to timely file: the $500 exemption confirmation in which no fines were imposed; two orders denying Motions for Reconsideration, and two orders in which a total of $3,300, and fines, 1,000.

During the month of September 2019, the Office of the General Counsel imposed fines against the following respondents:

A fine of $2,300 was imposed against Karen for the Ward 7 State Board of Education for failure to timely file a report.

A fine of $1,000 was imposed against the DC Bike Life Campaign for failure to timely file a report.

And during the month of September 2019, the Office of the General Counsel collected a total of $1,550 in fines. The Office collected
the final payment of $1,550 in fines from Jeffrey
Thompson. This marks the conclusion of Mr.
Thompson's obligations under a Settlement
Agreement that was reached between Mr. Thompson
in December of 2017 in which he was required to
pay a total of $80,000 in fines. The breakdown
on the payments included a $50,000 payment
initially and 20 payments on a monthly basis of
$1,500 each. I am pleased to announce that Mr.
Thompson was fully compliant with the agreement
and this concludes his engagement with our
Office.

In addition, the Office of General
Counsel collected a $50 fine from the Economic
Protection PAC.

During the month of September 2019,
the Office of the General Counsel opened a full
investigation. The Complainant in the
investigation was ANC Commissioner Edward Hanlon.
His Complaint was received on the 5th September
2019, and the Respondents were the following
Advisory Neighborhood Commissioners: Daniel
Warwick of Single Member District B02; Aaron Landry of Single Member District B04; Randy Downs of Single Member District B05; Matthew Sampson, Single Member District B01; Mike Silverstein, Single Member District B06, and Kari Cunningham of Single Member District 2B07.

The allegation in Mr. Hanlon's Complaint was that these members of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission have engaged in inappropriate use of government resources. Specifically, he has alleged that they used the government ANC Twitter account to promote the candidacy of a candidate for Ward 2, City Council.

During the month of September 2019, there were no requests for opinions and no show cause proceedings were conducted.

And that should conclude the report from the Office of Campaign Finance.

CHAIR BENNETT: All right. That's it, Mr. Sanford?

MR. SANFORD: That should conclude our
CHAIR BENNETT: Great. Thank you.

Any questions, Mr. Gill?

MEMBER GILL: No questions. Thank you, Bill.

CHAIR BENNETT: Any questions from anybody else?

(No response.)

Okay. Great.

The next item on the agenda is Ms. Miller, the Executive Director's Report.

MS. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The first item on my agenda, on my report, I will turn it over to Mr. Budoo regarding the proposed polling relocations and final adoption of one precinct.

MR. BUDO0: Good morning. Arlin Budoo, Facility Operation Manager for the Board of Elections.

My first relocation will be for Precinct No. 14, St. Thomas Episcopal Church Parish was the former voting place, and we
relocated to the M.A.A. Carriage House meeting
space for construction that was being done to the
church. The construction has now been completed.
I have went back to the facility and requested
that we relocate back, and they have approved the
Board to relocate back to St. Thomas Episcopal
Church, located at 1517 18th Street, Northwest.

The voter registration for that
precinct is 4,798 in Ward 2. The building is
accessible with slight modifications. And when I
say "slight modifications," there is no push-
button door to enter the facility, but that was
something that they'll again work out with the
poll workers. The voting area is the
multipurpose room. The voting space is excellent
and their lighting is excellent. There's street
parking, and it's directly across the street from
the previous polling place right now.

The next site is Precinct No. 27,
which is Eaton Elementary School. This facility
will not be available for the upcoming 2020
primary and general elections. The facility is
closed right now for scheduled renovations. I propose that we relocate to Cleveland Park Library, located at 3310 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest. We'll be using the multipurpose room.

The facility is accessible. The voting space is excellent. The lighting is excellent. There is street parking, and it is located approximately two blocks from the current polling place.

MS. MILLER: Mr. Budoo?

MR. BUDOO: Yes?

MS. MILLER: On that one, is that the same location we use for early voting?

MR. BUDOO: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIR BENNETT: We use the library --

MR. BUDOO: Yes.

CHAIR BENNETT: -- for early voting now?

MR. BUDOO: Yes.

CHAIR BENNETT: But not for regular voting?
MR. BUDOO: Not for regular voting. We just use it for early voting, but we'll be using it for both for the upcoming elections.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. Okay.

MEMBER GILL: It just reopened.

CHAIR BENNETT: Yes, it did. That's a nice facility. Okay.

MR. BUDOO: Okay. The next location is Precinct No. 40, which is Bancroft Elementary School. We relocated from Bancroft Elementary School because it was not available for the 2018 primary and general elections for scheduled renovations. The renovations have been completed.

The Board was contacted by the current ANC residents after the school completed their renovations requesting that we relocate back. I did speak with the school staff and we have been approved to relocate back to Bancroft Elementary School, located at 1755 Newton Street, Northwest. We will be using the gymnasium.

This site is successful with a few
modifications. And when I say "modifications,"
the entrance that they would use at the school is
not a smooth surface, but we will contact and
speak with the site and DGS to see if we can
bring that up-to-speed.

The area that we'll be using is the
gymnasium. The voting space is excellent. Their
lighting is excellent. There is street parking,
and it's approximately four blocks from the
current location, which is the Mt. Pleasant
Neighborhood Library.

The next precinct will be Precinct No.
54, which is West Education Campus. This
facility, the school is also going into
construction, due to be completed around
September of 2021, and it will not be available
for the upcoming 2020 primary and general
election.

I propose that we relocate to St.
Luke's Baptist Church, located at 1415 Gallatin
Street, Northwest. This facility is directly
across the street from the school. It is
accessible with a few modifications. The area
that we’ll be using is the church hall. The
voting space is excellent. The lighting is
excellent, and there's street parking.

The next facility we will be
relocating is Precinct No. 57, which is currently
the Hattie Holmes Senior Wellness Center, located
at 324 Kennedy Street. The school staff reached
out to the Board to get more engaged with the
facility. They used to use the school when it
was Rudolph Elementary School, but the school
closed and a charter school did come in. So,
there was major construction done to the facility
where it was unavailable. The school has
reopened and they did reach out to the Board
requesting us to come back and use the site as a
polling place.

So, I would propose that we relocate
to the new Washington Latin Public Charter
School, located at 5200 Second Street, Northwest.
We will be using the gymnasium. It is accessible
with slight modifications. And what the slight
modification is, the entrance to the door has that bar that holds the door in place. So, that will have to be removed to make it fully accessible.

For voting here, we'll be using the gymnasium. The voting space is excellent. The lighting is excellent. There is a parking lot and street parking, and it is located approximately six blocks from the Hattie Holmes Senior Wellness Center.

The next site is Precinct No. 89. As you may be aware, during the November 2018 general election, there was a longer-than-normal line at the Eastern Market, and that was because we had two precincts combined, Precinct No. 88 and Precinct No. 89. The reason they were combined is because there are no alternative locations located within Precinct 88 that would have met the Board's needs and requirements.

So, therefore, I propose that we relocate Precinct 89 to the Capitol Hill United Methodist Church, located at 421 Seward Square,
Southeast. We will be using the fellowship hall.

This site is accessible with slight modifications. The voting space is excellent.
The lighting is excellent. There's street parking, and it's approximately three blocks from the current place. Precinct 88 will remain at Eastern Market, and we'll just be relocating Precinct 89.

The last precinct for relocation is Precinct 99.

CHAIR BENNETT: Let's go back on that one.

MR. BUDOO: Yes.

CHAIR BENNETT: That one was a major issue then and for several voting cycles. I guess the question I have, part of the challenge there was just equipment. Are we doing -- I meant this question for Ms. Miller -- are we getting additional equipment for 89 --

MR. BUDOO: Yes.

CHAIR BENNETT: -- that's over and above what we already had? So, we would actually
plus-up our equipment --

MR. BUDOO: Yes.

CHAIR BENNETT: -- at the new 89?

MR. BUDOO: Yes, sir.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay.

MS. MILLER: And with the relocation, we'll be splitting -- half of those people won't be in that location anyway.

CHAIR BENNETT: Right. Very good.

MS. MILLER: Yes. So, it will help with equipment plus minimizing the number of voters that will be voting within 89 as well.

CHAIR BENNETT: Good. All right. And how close -- I think this is pretty close, isn't it, to Eastern Market?

MR. BUDOO: Yes.

CHAIR BENNETT: The new place?

MR. BUDOO: It's three blocks.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. So, what are we doing to make sure people don't get confused?

MR. BUDOO: Okay. Well, this is just a proposal stage. But we'll come back to the
Board for you to approve it finally, and then, we'll contact all the registered voters letting them know their precinct has moved.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. Because --

MR. BUDOOL: And we'll also put it in --

CHAIR BENNETT: Absolutely. Everybody needs to go in there and not stand in lines.

MR. BUDOOL: Right.

CHAIR BENNETT: So, we've really got to work on making sure that people who are assigned to the new place know. I don't have the magic wand, but we just need to focus on that.

MS. MILLER: That's will all relocations. With all our relocations, we have to put that same process in play.

CHAIR BENNETT: I understand, but this one is going to be a little different. I mean, well, this, in my view, has a little more -- you know, everybody is used to going there. It's a boatload of people. It has a very high voter turnout, and we've just got to make sure that
there's as little confusion as possible. There will be some confusion, but we just have to make sure there's very few. Because we need to have somebody onsite to say, hey, your -- just suggesting.

All right. Thanks.

MR. BUDO: And the last precinct for relocation is Precinct No. 99. As you know, in past elections Precinct 99 was relocated with Precinct 98 at Smothers Elementary School. We were previously at the Ward Memorial AME Church, but that church was condemned structurally after the earthquake in 2011. The renovations and construction have been completed to the facility.

And I propose that we relocate back to Ward Memorial AME Church, located at 241 42nd Street, Northeast. The facility is accessible with slight modifications. We'll be using the fellowship hall. The voting space is excellent. The lighting is excellent. There's street parking, and it's approximately three blocks from the current polling place.
CHAIR BENNETT: And how long were we at Smothers?

MR. BUDO: We were at Smothers through the 2012, 2014, and 2016, and 2018.

CHAIR BENNETT: So, it's been a while?

MR. BUDO: Yes, sir.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay.

MR. BUDO: It took the church some time to get that structure redone. They had to raise the funds for the facility. It did take a while, but it has been completed now.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. Okay.

MR. BUDO: And my last item is for the new proposed Precinct 144. I did submit this at the August 7th Board hearing. We did receive feedback from the ANC Commissioners of that area and they did approve the new proposed 144. So, I just would ask that that be made final today.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. All right.

Any questions, Mr. Gill?

MEMBER GILL: No questions. Thanks, Arlin. Again, great job.
CHAIR BENNETT: Can we get a motion to approve the relocation of the precincts?

MEMBER GILL: So, we have a motion to approve the proposed polling place relocations, and then, we have a motion to finalize the creation of 144.

MR. BUDO: Yes, sir.

CHAIR BENNETT: Good. All right.

Second. So, it's unanimous.

MR. BUDO: All right.

CHAIR BENNETT: Thanks.

Ms. Miller?

MS. MILLER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Bennett.

To continue with my agenda, we've been working on a National Voter Registration Act Training Manual for our Voter Registration Agencies. There are 12 D.C. agencies that have been designated as Voter Registration Agencies. Federal and District law requires VRAs, which are the Voter Registration Agencies, to offer voter registration services as part of their agencies'
core duties. The manual addresses various topics, including what VRAs must do to comply with District and Federal law, or services VRAs must offer and how and when it must be offered, and what information must be kept confidential.

So, we'll be using the manual as a training guide when we go out to train our Voter Registration Agencies on how to process and offer voter registration to their clients, as they sign up for the various services that they offer.

Also, our continuing poll worker training, which we've been doing all summer, we were able to get the stipends out for the first set of trainings that we had. That's for our captains and special ballot clerks. They went through two sessions of training. The first session had 251 participants and the second one 276. They have received their payments of $80 per session that they were trained for, for a total of $160. I just want to put that on the record, that that payment has gone out.

As of yesterday, we began continuing
poll worker training for our check-in clerks, and
we'll do two sessions a day for the next two
weeks with the check-in clerks to have them
trained.

With respect to outreach, our National
Voter Registration Week was held last week in the
last week of September. At the time, the Voter
Education and Outreach Division, VEOD,
coordinated and attended 19 events for that week.
For example, on Saturday, September 21st, they
were at a total of four or five different
locations between the hours of noon and 7:00.
All of those were overlapping events.

So, again, I just want to congratulate
and thank them for doing that. Because they are
a very small team of two, we use other members of
the staff to try to help supplement what's needed
to get the D.C. events covered for outreach. For
the month of September, we did a total of 37
events.

Obviously, again, the purpose of these
events is to identify and register eligible
voters. We do some poll work recruitment and
provide information to our returning citizens and
incarcerated eligible voters, as well as reaching
out to high school students for voter
registration. We had equipment available at many
of the events, and it provides an opportunity for
voters to begin to learn how to, and have access
to, the equipment for using it on Election Day.

We begin training on Monday for our
new Voter Registration System. So, the staff
right now is in the process of being trained on
how to perform the various functions that they'll
be responsible for completing with the new
upgrades, with the new system. That's with our
new contractor. The upgrades will include,
obviously, how to now enter a voter record,
assign polling locations, voters' absentee ballot
processing, and all the other details associated
with voter registration. So, the training is
end-user training and it's currently scheduled
with the various Divisions for the next two
weeks.
And that concludes my portion.

CHAIR BENNETT: Good.

Any questions, Mr. Gill?

MEMBER GILL: No questions.

CHAIR BENNETT: Great. Thanks.

The next item on the agenda is the General Counsel's Report, Ms. Stroud.

MS. STROUD: Good morning, everyone.

The first item on my agenda is OCF Petitions for Enforcement, and I'll have Staff Attorney Rudolph McGann come and do a presentation on the Petitions for Enforcement that we are seeking to bring before the D.C. Superior Court for enforcement on behalf of the Office of Campaign Finance.

CHAIR BENNETT: Great. Thanks.

Good morning, Mr. McGann.

MR. McGANN: Good morning. Rudolph McGann, staff attorney for the Board of Elections.

The matters that the Office of General Counsel seeks enforcement for are as follows:
First, Docket No. 17C-027, Justin Green for Treasurer, the amount in question of $1650 for a failure to report receipts and expenditures that was due on October 10th, 2017. The Respondent has not filed to date. However, phone calls were placed to the Respondent and letters sent on September 18th and September 25th; informed him of this proceeding. And the Board also conducted prehearing conferences on July 11th and July 24th, and the Respondent did not appear at those conferences.

The next matter is, again, Justin Green, Docket No. 18C-002, and the amount of the fine is $1400 for failure to report receipts and expenditures for January 31st, 2018. The Respondent has not to date filed. Letters were sent by first class mail on the 18th and the 25th of September informing him of this hearing. Prehearing dates were July 17th and August 9th of this year, and the Respondent did not appear at either of those prehearings.

The next matter is Oliver for Ward 4,
2015, Docket No. 18C-003. The amount of the fine is $2150 for failure to report receipts and expenditures, due February 16th, 2018. The Respondent was notified by mail on the 18th and 25th of September about this meeting. The Board's Office of General Counsel held prehearing conferences on July 17th and August 9th of this year, and the Respondent has not appeared.

The next matter is Committee to Elect Khalid Pitts 2014, 18C-005. The amount of the fine is $2150 for failure to report receipts and expenditures, due February 16th, 2018. The Respondent has not filed the report as of today. The Respondent was notified by mail on the 18th and the 25th of September about this hearing, and the Respondent was invited to appear on the 17th of July and the 9th of August of this year for a prehearing conference in an attempt to settle this matter, and did not appear.

The next matter is Patterson for Ward 8, Docket No. 18C-007. The amount of the fine is $2150. The missing filing was the January 31st
report of receipts and expenditures, which was
due on February 16, 2018. The Respondent has
failed to file that report to date. The
Respondent was notified by mail on the 18th and
25th of September about this meeting, as well as
the Office of General Counsel attempted to hold
prehearing conferences in this matter on July
17th and August 9th of this year. The Respondent
has not shown for any of these hearings or
prehearing conferences and is not here today.

The next matter is Justin Green At-
Large, 18C-018, for fines for $1,000 for failure
to file the March 10th report of receipts and
expenditures. The Respondent has not filed as of
today. Respondent was notified by mail on the
18th and 25th of this month -- excuse me -- of
September regarding this meeting, as well as the
Respondent was requested to be at a prehearing in
this matter on July 17th and August 9th of this
year. The Respondent has not appeared in any of
those hearings.

The next matter is MMC Foundation,
18C-021, a fine of $500 for failure to report receipts and expenditures, due March 10th, 2018. The Respondent has filed and is in compliance with the OCF statute at this time. The Office of General Counsel sent mail on the 18th and 25th regarding this meeting. The Respondent is not here today, although he did appear at a prehearing notice -- or excuse me -- a prehearing conference on July 17th, at which time he stressed that he didn't have the money to pay, but he offered to pay $5 a month with respect to this fine.

The last is, again, MMC Foundation, Docket No. 18P-001, fine in the amount of $1,050 for failure to file the January 31st report of receipts and expenditures. However, the Respondent has filed his report and is in compliance with the statute. He was notified of this hearing on the 18th and 25th of September and attended a prehearing conference on July 11th -- excuse me -- July 17th of this year. And at that time, again, he expressed that he didn't
have the money to pay the fine. He offered to pay $5 a month for a $1,000 fine, a $1,050 fine. And that is all the matters that we have before you. These are the same matters that were introduced last meeting. However, service was, admittedly, short, and what we did was we tried to accommodate these respondents coming before the Board this meeting, but no one has appeared.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. Great.

MS. STROUD: In light of the information presented by Mr. McGann, and the Board's efforts to secure resolution of these matters prior to the Board hearing, and that being to no avail, we ask that the Board move to proceed before the D.C. Superior Court for enforcement of these orders on behalf of OCF.

CHAIR BENNETT: Is there any motion?

Mr. Gill?

MEMBER GILL: Motion to proceed.

CHAIR BENNETT: Seconded. Please proceed. Thank you.
MR. McGANN: Thank you.

MS. STROUD: So, the next item on my agenda is the litigation status. And I'll just note for the record, in response to a question that was asked earlier with respect to litigation for the Office of Campaign Finance, that the Board's Office of the General Counsel represents OCF in litigation matters in the District Courts. And so, those Petitions for Enforcement will be handled by the Office of the General Counsel on behalf of OCF.

And our current litigations that I will now read are the cases that the Board and OCF have pending currently. There are no cases that involve the Office of Campaign Finance, but if there were, we would handle those on behalf of the Office of Campaign Finance. I just wanted to say that for the record.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay.

MS. STROUD: Litigation status. The first case is William Hunt v. the Board. This matter was filed in the U.S. District Court for
the District of Columbia in October of 2018. And it's a complaint regarding a counting of write-in votes cast in the 2018 election. Mr. Hunt was a write-in mayoral candidate, and he wanted the Board to count and give him an itemization of the ballots that had been tallied for him, and the Board was not required to do so.

Mr. Hunt filed -- we filed a Motion to Dismiss in April of 2019. Mr. Hunt filed a Motion in Opposition to that motion on August 20th. On August 27th, the Board filed a reply to Mr. Hunt's opposition to the Board's Motion to Dismiss. And briefing should be completed until the Court renders an order.

The second item on litigation status is Butler v. the Board of Elections. This was an action for writ in the nature of mandamus to compel the Board to accept the D.C. Time Limits Campaign Initiative as a proper subject. Both parties have attempted to file Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment on November 21st.

The next case is Graham v. the Board.
This involves the Board's appeal on a Permanent Injunction entered by the D.C. Superior Court on December 12th, 2018 which prohibits the Board from taking any action on Referendum 8.

The Board and the proposer who joined the matter as an Intervenor filed a joint brief and appendix on June 26th. On September 10th, the Appellees filed their brief, and the Board filed a reply to the Appellees' brief on yesterday. The Court of Appeals has ordered the case be scheduled for consideration before its Merit Division as soon as the calendar permits.

The next two cases have been consolidated. They are Phillip Hammond v. the Board and Robin Marlin v. the Board. These matters involve appeals of Board orders which upheld the resolutions of ANC 7B, finding no vacancies in Single Member Districts 7B04 and 7B05. The resolutions found that the Advisory Neighborhood Commission at issue did, in fact, meet the residency qualifications necessary to continue serving as ANC Commissioners.
On August 13th -- actually, on September 6th, the Board filed a response to a previous pleading filed by the Petitioners in which they asserted that their claim should not be dismissed for untimeliness. On September 6th, the Court of Appeals consolidated both cases and directed the Board to file the designations of record in these matters on or before September 30th, and the Board complied on September 30th, this past Monday.

And that concludes my litigation status.

The next item on my agenda are two rulemakings, both from the Office of Campaign Finance. And I will defer to the Office of Campaign Finance's General Counsel, Mr. Sanford, for discussion on the purpose of these rulemakings.

MR. SANFORD: Thank you very much. Good morning again, Mr. Chairman and Distinguished Board Member Gill.

The first item regarding final
rulemaking for Chapters 42 and 43 involved the Fair Elections Program. And this was previously approved by the Board for publication in the D.C. Register on August 16th of this year. And so, we are now requesting final approval. And just to give a few of the highlights of this rulemaking, I will just point out the changes that have occurred.

Subsection 4201.11 requires candidates and registrants to provide W-2s and W-9s and the ACH enrollment forms in order to receive payment through the electronic disbursement process under the Fair Elections Program.

Subsection 4205.3 provides that a donor may agree to recurring contributions after the initial assent has been provided in writing if they indicate that they will accept that.

Subsection 4205.5 also provides that contributions by telephone may include an oral assent to the contribution.

Subsection 4205.6 provides for the establishment of Fair Elections Committees and
Fair Elections Committees are limited to a contribution of $1,500 to a Fair Elections candidate.

Subsection 4206.10 defines immediate family under the Fair Elections Program to include spouse or domestic partner of a candidate; any parent, grandparent, brother, sister, or child of the candidate, and the spouse or domestic partner of any such parent, grandparent, brother, sister, or child.

Subsection 4205.1 requires return of excessive or prohibited funds by candidates and committees through a bank or certified check.

Subsection 4206.3 provides for 10 business days for the Office of Campaign Finance to certify a committee or a candidate for the Fair Elections Program. It also provides 10 days to appeal a denial of a certification. That Subsection, further, provides that the revocation of a certification may also be appealed within 10 days.

Subsection 4206.13 provides for
rolling certifications dates that are generally
every 30 days through October 31st and they
continue on the 10th of each month, commencing in
January during an election year.

Subsection 4207 provides that the
Office of Campaign Finance, the Director of the
Office of Campaign Finance is required to submit
a Request for Disbursement for the base amount
funds within five days after certification. It
also provides that the balance of the base amount
in funds will be provided after the candidate or
committee has achieved ballot access.

Subsection 4208.2 addresses the
matching funds provisions of 5-to-1, which means
that a certified candidate or committee is
entitled to receive matching funds under this
program that are five times the amount that they
have raised from District residents.

Chapter 42 also includes provisions
for remitting and donating equipment within 60
days of the conclusion of the campaign or the
conclusion of the election. It also requires
that the equipment may be donated to a nonprofit
which is in good standing in the District of
Columbia for at least one year prior to the
donation.

And Chapter 42 also requires that the
candidates and committees file their reports of
receipts and expenditures on new filing dates
that will commence on March 10th, June 10th,
August 10th, October 10th, and December 10th in
the seven months prior to the date of an
election, and March 10th, April 10th, May 10th,
June 10th, August 10th, October 10th and the 8
day pre-primary and pre-general dates of a year
of elections.

The second rulemaking covers Chapters
30, 37, 41, and 99. And they include the
following:

Subsection 300.29 requires a
certification that expenditures -- independent
expenditure committees certify to the Office of
Campaign Finance that they have not been
controlled, coordinated, or consulted with any
public official or political committee. It further requires that an independent expenditure committee has not transferred funds to a public official, political committee, or Political Action Committee.

Subsection 3008.16 requires any person other than a political committee, a Political Action Committee, or an independent expenditure (sic) who makes an independent expenditure of $1,000 or more within a calendar year provide a report to the Office of Campaign Finance within 14 days of the independent expenditure.

Subsection 3008.24 requires political committees, Political Action Committees, and independent expenditure committees to report in a separate schedule the names, address, employer, and occupation of each person who has bundled an amount in excess of $5,000 during any reporting period.

Subsection 3008.27 requires also the certification of non-control by a political committee or Political Action Committee or public
Subsection 3011.3 limits contributions to political committees and Political Action Committees to $5,000.

Subsection 3015 identifies the methods for disbursement of surplus funds and imposes personal liability against candidates for any unresolved debts that have not been resolved 12 months after the election. It also requires an oral statement in a political advertisement that identifies independent expenditures -- identifies the top five contributors to independent expenditures whose contributions were made during the 12 months prior to the advertisement.

Subsection 3711.3 establishes $4,000 as the maximum fines for all violations of the Campaign Finance Act, including violations related to constituent services problems.

Subsection 3800.1, 3803.1, and 3904.1 reduces the amount that may be contributed to legal defense committees and inaugural committees. Under Subsection 3803.1, the
contribution limits to legal defense committees
have been reduced from $10,000 to $2,000. Under
Subsection 3904.1, the contribution limits for
mayoral inaugural committees have been reduced
from $10,000 to $4,000.

Also, provides that the duration of a
mayoral inaugural committee cannot exceed six
months after the beginning of the new term.
Also, indicates that all unresolved debts -- that
all personal liability is imposed for all
unresolved debts of inaugural committees.

Subsection 4004.1 reduces
contributions to mayoral transition committees to
$2,000. Also, provides for contributions of not
more than $1,500 to transition committees for
Council Chair and Attorney General.

Subsection 4006.1 requires the
termination of all mayoral, chairmen, and
Attorney General transition committees no later
than six months after the new term and imposes
personal liability on the mayor, the chairmen,
Attorney General for all unresolved debts for
transition committees after six months after the
beginning of the new term.

And Subsection 9900 expands the
definition provisions, and that will be available
at the website of the Office of Campaign Finance,
in addition to publication in the D.C. Register.

And in view of the information
foregoing, the Office of Campaign Finance
respectfully asks the Board to approve these
provisions for final rulemaking regarding
Chapters 42 and 43 and emergency rulemaking for
the additional chapters that we just covered.

CHAIR BENNETT: Can I get a motion?

Ms. Stroud, do you have something else
you would add?

MS. STROUD: Well, I would just
reiterate Mr. Sanford's request that the Board
allow for the submission of these rulemakings to
the D.C. Register for publication.

With respect to the final rulemaking,
that just closes the loop with respect to we
initially published it in emergency and proposed
form. And so, once this is published as final, it will be final and effective upon publication in the D.C. Register.

And with respect to the second rulemaking, the emergency or proposed rulemaking with respect to the Campaign Finance Reform Act, this would send the document up to the D.C. Register for public comment for the review period, and the Board would not take final rulemaking action until at least 30 days have passed. But they will be in emergency or proposed rulemaking form upon publication in the D.C. Register, which should take place not this Friday, but next Friday.

So, I move that we be permitted to proceed, that you adopt these regulations, and that we be permitted to submit them to the D.C. Register for publication.

MR. SANFORD: I would just want to add that the emergency rulemaking is required because the provisions in the emergency rulemaking already into the record are provisions that
become effective subject to, pursuant to the
Budget Support Emergency Act of 2019, which was
effective on September 11th, 2019.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay.

MEMBER GILL: So, we're making two
motions here? A motion for the proposal and a
motion for the final, or can we --

MS. STROUD: We can combine them.

MEMBER GILL: Okay. So, we're on a
motion to combine both rulemaking and proceed to
send them to D.C. Register.

MS. BRIZILL: Mr. Chairman, I have a
question.

CHAIR BENNETT: And the final rule.

MS. BRIZILL: I have a question.

CHAIR BENNETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BRIZILL: This is Dorothy Brizill
with DC Watch.

On the agenda you have two separate
items. No. 1, final rulemaking, and, No. 2,
emergency and proposed rulemaking. Given what
Mr. Sanford has gone through, what are the
emergency rulemaking positions and what's the
difference between the emergency and proposed?
Because, look, my question is, what is the
difference between the emergency and the
proposed?

CHAIR BENNETT: Ms. Brizill, we'll entertain your question. We're a little bit off the agenda, but we're happy to entertain the question.

To Ms. Stroud and Mr. Sanford, do you want to respond to that?

MS. STROUD: So, there are two separate rulemakings. One is a final rulemaking regarding the Fair Elections Program.

MS. BRIZILL: And that is the ones that you have listed in the agenda under No. 1?

MS. STROUD: Yes.

MR. SANFORD: Yes, yes.

MS. BRIZILL: Okay. Then, on No. 2, you have the term "emergency and proposed rulemaking," and you don't make a distinction in the agenda. What is the emergency and what are
the proposed rulemakings?

MS. STROUD: It's combined. It's emergency and proposed.

MEMBER GILL: It's one rulemaking. It is both emergency and proposed.

MS. BRIZILL: So, if you took action today, if the Board took action today, this rulemaking would go into effect immediately upon being published in --

MS. STROUD: On an emergency basis, yes.

MS. BRIZILL: And how long would it be in effect as an emergency?

MS. STROUD: Well, we're going to take final rulemaking action on it after 30 days have passed to allow for a public comment period.

MS. BRIZILL: Well --

MS. STROUD: It would be in effect I believe -- and I can check this -- for, I think, 120 days, but I can check that.

MS. BRIZILL: Can I ask the question then, if the Board was going to put on its agenda
emergency rulemaking, why didn't it at least
publish on its website this emergency rulemaking?

MS. STROUD: Because the Board has to
approve them for publication, for publication in
the D.C. Register. The Board has not taken
action with respect to these rules yet. They're
doing that right now, which will allow us to --
they're going to adopt them now. Before they
adopted them, there was nothing to read --

MEMBER GILL: They could change up
until the time we vote to put them in there. So,
the time --

MS. BRIZILL: They can change up until
the time of what?

MEMBER GILL: Until they're --

MS. STROUD: They're adopted.

MEMBER GILL: Until they're adopted.

So, there's no point in publishing them for
comment because there's nothing to comment on
until we agree that these are the ones we want.

CHAIR BENNETT: And the public has an
opportunity to comment after they are published
anyway.

MS. BRIZILL: Mr. Chairman, my question and concern is, the emergency rules will go into effect for 120 days, correct? After the Board votes on them today?

CHAIR BENNETT: Yes, that's correct.

MS. BRIZILL: Okay. If a citizen or a voter had a concern or an issue about the proposed rulemaking, you did not publish it on your website before today. I made inquiry of your Public Information Officer two days ago for a copy of it. I was told it would not be ready until today's meeting. Okay. But, meanwhile, you're enacting rules that will affect citizens for at least 120 days.

MEMBER GILL: Well, it's the emergency nature of the --

CHAIR BENNETT: Well, that's the nature of the emergency, and you do have an opportunity to comment on it while it's on the website.

Are there any other --
MR. SANFORD: May I make one response --

CHAIR BENNETT: Sure.

MR. SANFORD: -- to Ms. Brizill?

These rules are designed to implement legislation that's already been passed by the Council that became, under the Budget Support Review Act of 2019, that became effective on September 11th. So, we are providing emergency rules so we can implement what the Council has already passed. So, it is not that these rules originate with us. These are rules that are pursuant to legislative action by the D.C. Court.

MS. STROUD: And this is not distinct from our process in the past.

MS. BRIZILL: I didn't say your process in the past was right then, did I?

CHAIR BENNETT: Well, we're going to move forward. Are there any other comments, Ms. Brizill?

Thank you.

So, can we entertain the motion,
please?

MEMBER GILL: So, I think we have a motion to proceed with the proposed rulemaking and the -- the emergency and proposed rulemaking and the final rulemaking.

CHAIR BENNETT: That motion is seconded. And so, it is unanimous. We will move forward accordingly. Okay? Thank you.

Anything else, Ms. Stroud?

MS. STROUD: No, that concludes my report. Thank you.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay. Final is public matters. And so, if you don't mind, what I would like to do is I believe, if Mr. Sindran is still on the line, I will ask Mr. Sindran to bring back any pertinent matters that he had, and then, we'll go to people that are physically here in the room.

Mr. Sindran, do you have any items for the Board?

MR. SINDRAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIR BENNETT: Well, if there is anybody else on the line -- I don't know if there's anybody else on the line. I only have heard from Mr. Sindran.

Okay, Mr. Sindran?

MR. SINDRAN: Mr. Gill, we need the elephant in the room. And obviously, the donkey has got to go. We need an elephant in the room, Mr. Gill, desperately.

CHAIR BENNETT: Mr. Sindran, would you identify yourself, please, for the record?

MR. SINDRAN: Absolutely. You already did, Mr. Chair. Michael Sindran, disabled veteran, served our country more than most.

My concern --

CHAIR BENNETT: And your address, sir?

MR. SINDRAN: 6645 Georgia Avenue, Northwest, Ward 4, Washington, D.C., which happens to be a federal territory, although we're not a state yet.

My concern and question is -- and I think Mr. Gill touched on it somewhat -- the
duplicative recall petitions. And the danger is that seeking the same objective, although different agendas, they sink both. So, what mechanism is in place or can be put in place to merge the two to achieve the objective, notwithstanding separate agendas, or what have you, so that it will not be an exercise in futility?

MEMBER GILL: So, Michael, I'm not so sure we'd want something hardwired in place. This is a rare occasion. And you could conceivably have two petitions that are looking for the same outcome, but distinctly different, and would end up with different ballot measures because of the way the petitions are written and what they're seeking to do.

And so, I would rather keep the rules as they are and encourage people that have the same objective to join forces before they put together two separate petitions. The problem here is that you've got two separate petitions, two separate groups that have organized for the
same outcome, and rather than put the cart before the horse and have the Board of Elections change its statutes or have the Council sort of make a process to combine these things, I think it's just a matter of, you know, if people can't join forces, then this is what they face. They have two different petitions that are under two separate requirements. I think it's a lot easier just to have people organize beforehand rather than everything get convoluted on the back-end.

MR. SINDRAN: Well, that having been said, it may be easiest, but what will accomplish the goal? The two petitions as they stand may neutralize one with the other. And so, we're back to square one. And we're letting the corrupt official continue with impunity. That's what we're looking to avoid.

So, I want to defer to your wisdom, Mr. Chair. Maybe the wisdom of the Board can come up with something. Yes, we want to have democracy. Yes, we want to have transparency, and so on. But if you've got conflicting
petitions attempting to achieve the same goal, that will torpedo/neutralize one another, that makes no sense.

CHAIR BENNETT: Yes, if I understand, I don't necessarily have an answer, nor I'm not quite sure I agree with your position. But let me kind of take a right turn for a moment.

I've been urged to follow our regulations relative to limit public comment to three minutes. I would like to not do that. And so, I ask that the comments be efficient. And don't take it personal for anyone, Mr. Sindran on the phone or anybody here. But we want to try to be efficient. We understand that sometimes there are some concerns about our actions, and we want to hear about those. But if you can be efficient with your comments, I will work really hard to not impose the three-minute limit on the comments.

Anyway, please continue, Mr. Sindran.

MR. SINDRAN: I'm done. I put it out there, and something needs to get -- you've got
an objective, the same objective sought by two or more groups. And yet, they may neutralize one another in achieving that goal. So, I'm putting it out there to you, Mr. Chair, to you, Mr. Gill, anyone else within the sound of my voice. And I hear you. You know, come and let us reason together and join forces voluntarily. But if that's not possible to the different agendas, what could be done then? So as not to just rearrange the lawn chairs on a Titanic.

CHAIR BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Sindran.

MEMBER GILL: So, I think your comments are helpful, Michael, and that's the reason we brought it up earlier, to reflect on this. We wanted to make people aware of this. And so, I think your comments are helpful in that respect.

CHAIR BENNETT: Okay.

MR. SINDRAN: We need an elephant in the room, Mr. Gill.

MEMBER GILL: We've heard that comment
also.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR BENNETT: Thanks, Mr. Sindran.

Is there anyone other than Ms. Brizill with public comment?

(No response.)

Ms. Brizill, if you'd like to rejoin the podium?

And to try to respond to, I think, at least the questions you had initially in terms of preparation for 2020 elections, most of the questions were around information security from an IT or electronic perspective.

One of the things that we did was we had the same or very similar question, far more general, from Councilmember Cheh. And we did a pretty comprehensive response to her that I think addresses all, certainly 95 percent, if not all, of your questions that you provided earlier. So, rather than trying to answer each particular one, I'd like to give you a copy, if you don't have it already, of that particular response that we gave
to her.

The other item that you asked about, I think specific to my comment, was whether or not the voting machines were, in fact, connected to the internet. And the answer is they are not. They are closed. They do submit information to devices that end up being, but the voting machine itself, there is no connectivity to the internet overall for the voting machine. That doesn't mean somebody couldn't potentially tamper with it, or something like that. I think, though, if you take a look at that response we provided to Councilmember Cheh -- we also provided that to the Mayor's Office -- relative to our preparation, it gives a lot of detail about our connectivity in relationship with the federal government and work in that area.

So, Ms. Miller, did you want to add anything after that?

MS. MILLER: Just with respect to the question about all of the ballots being paper ballots, with the electronic machines, the
attached-screen machines that you vote on, what happens is that a paper ballot then comes out of that machine. Then, the voter places the paper ballot into the scanner, which then gives you the paper ballot for all our ballots, in addition to the regular paper ballot that a voter may have to use.

CHAIR BENNETT: So, any other comments, Ms. Brizill?

MS. BRIZILL: Can I go back? Mr. Bennett, at the September 5th meeting, in response to a question that was raised regarding the Windows 7 program and its impact on voting machines in the 2020 elections, you responded by stating that, "Voting machines in the District of Columbia are closed. They are not connected to the internet."

To Ms. Miller, my understanding is, once the polls close, the voting machines are, in fact, linked up by modem, and vote returns are returned to the Board of Elections by modem, is that correct?
MS. MILLER: We receive the results by modem, yes.

MS. BRIZILL: Okay.

CHAIR BENNETT: But that's not the individual machines. That's downloaded to the machines that the -- it's not the actual voting machines that you use. It's actually another machine that the votes are actually loaded into. So, the actual machine itself where one goes to cast their ballot is not connected to the internet.

MS. BRIZILL: Ms. Miller, what is connected? What machine? And if you don't call it a "voting machine," what do you call it in the polling site that is connected to the modem to send the returns here? What is it called?

MS. MILLER: A Ballot Box. It's a DS200.

MS. BRIZILL: DX --

MS. MILLER: DS200.

MS. BRIZILL: And it's called a "Ballot Box"?
MS. MILLER: It's the Ballot Box.

MS. BRIZILL: So, Mr. Bennett was technically correct when he says the voting machines are not connected to the internet, but the Ballot Box is connected to the internet to send the voting returns to the Board of Elections on election night? Correct?

MEMBER GILL: It's the modem, right?

MS. MILLER: It's a modem. It's not connected to the internet.

MEMBER GILL: It doesn't touch the internet. Where does the internet come into play in all this?

MS. BRIZILL: Ms. Miller, you just indicated that -- well, let me go back. At the September 5th Board meeting, Mr. Bennett indicated that the Board uses all paper ballots.

CHAIR BENNETT: If I said that, I was mistaken, Ms. Brizill. I don't recall.

MS. MILLER: That's not incorrect.

That's correct. We use paper ballots. When you, when a voter goes to vote on the electronic
machine, a paper ballot is produced.

CHAIR BENNETT: Right.

MS. MILLER: That paper ballot, then, is placed in the DS200 to tabulate the vote.

MS. BRIZILL: Ms. Miller, not unless you're changing it for the 2020 election. We have two separate voting machines at the polling sites, correct?

MS. MILLER: We have two separate ways to vote. You can vote with the actual paper ballot or you can vote on the electronic machine that produces a paper ballot.

MS. STROUD: And that is a ballot-marking device. So, you're just marking your ballot on that machine. Results voting --

MS. BRIZILL: Ms. Stroud, I was asking Ms. Miller the question.

Ms. Miller, you vote -- there are two ways to vote. One is you're given a paper ballot --

MS. MILLER: Correct.

MS. BRIZILL: -- and you feed it into
the machine, and you vote. The second is by --
there's an electronic means in the machine in
which you just indicate on that machine what your
choices are, is that correct?

    MS. MILLER: That's correct.

    MS. BRIZILL: Do you consider that a
paper ballot?

    MEMBER GILL: It produces a paper
ballot. You look -- you have a piece of paper in
your hand.

    MS. BRIZILL: Does it hand the voter
a paper ballot?

    MEMBER GILL: Yes.

    MS. MILLER: Yes, it does.

    MEMBER GILL: Have you voted?

    MS. BRIZILL: Mr. Gill, I was asking
Ms. Miller who --

    MEMBER GILL: Have you voted?

    CHAIR BENNETT: Hold on. Time out.

    MS. BRIZILL: -- whether it gives the
voter a paper ballot.

    MS. MILLER: Yes, it hands the voter
a paper ballot.

MS. BRIZILL: Okay.

MS. MILLER: It does hand the voter a paper ballot.

MS. BRIZILL: Okay.

CHAIR BENNETT: Ms. Brizill, if you would, I would prefer that you read -- look, with all the questions with regard to the preparation of --

MS. BRIZILL: No, I'm not going to read it now. I came here --

CHAIR BENNETT: I'm not suggesting that you --

MS. BRIZILL: You have a once-a-month meeting. The public has the right to come and ask questions. Okay?

CHAIR BENNETT: Ms. Brizill, but you don't have the right to sit here and talk and harass people for 20 or 30 minutes.

MS. BRIZILL: And you think this is harassment? This is --

CHAIR BENNETT: Yes, ma'am.
MS. BRIZILL: -- the public asking you questions.

Ms. Miller, what can you tell us about cybersecurity as regards the Board of Elections 2020 election preparation?

CHAIR BENNETT: Ms. -- all of that is answered in that --

MS. BRIZILL: I would like, I would like --

CHAIR BENNETT: Ms. Miller is not going to answer your question, Ms. Brizill. All that is answered in that particular --

MS. BRIZILL: I hope the court reporter is taking all of this.

CHAIR BENNETT: Yes, I really wish you would. But your questions are all answered in that document, Ms. Brizill.

MS. BRIZILL: Mr. Bennett, I can here --

CHAIR BENNETT: I'm not going to argue with you, Ms. --

MS. BRIZILL: I have once a month to
come and ask -- okay? -- these questions. Okay?

CHAIR BENNETT: Ms. Brizill, and we have answered those questions. We have provided you with something that's even better than sitting here and having a conversation. We have provided you with a document that answers all those questions you raise.

MS. BRIZILL: Ms. Miller, have you hired a cybersecurity staff person down here?

MS. MILLER: No, not at this time.

We're in the process of doing that.

MS. BRIZILL: Ms. Miller, in terms of federal funds, what federal funds have you received in 2018 and you received in 2019 from the Federal Elections Systems Commission?

MS. MILLER: Nothing in 2019 and 2018. EAC provided a $3 million grant to the Board.

MS. BRIZILL: A $3 million grant for what?

MS. MILLER: It was for election administration.

MS. BRIZILL: Election administration?
MS. MILLER: Yes.

MS. BRIZILL: Would you be surprised in their report and documents on their website they indicate that they have given you money for four areas: cybersecurity, voting equipment, voter registration, and communication? So, what are you doing in those four areas that you got the money from the federal government for?

MS. MILLER: Okay. That's all under the EAC, under the HAVA funds. All of the HAVA funds are defined for the administration of elections. Those are just specific that we indicated that we would use the money for.

MS. BRIZILL: Okay. Let me go back and give you a chance to amend your answer. You indicated that you did receive $3 million for election administration.

MS. MILLER: Right.

MS. BRIZILL: What do you include in the term "election administration"?

MS. MILLER: The administration of elections as defined by HAVA.
MS. BRIZILL: You applied for funds specifically to the Federal Election Assistance Commission for four areas: cybersecurity, voter equipment, voter registration, and communication. What are you doing, what are you going to use those funds in terms of expenditures for voting equipment?

MS. MILLER: Rather than me sit here and try to recall it, let me give it to you in a written document, because there's a number of different things that we're doing. I just can't recall offhand all of the ways that money is being disbursed.

MS. BRIZILL: Do you believe that the Board will do a better job in expending those funds than it did in previous HAVA funds which sat in the Office of CFO for years and not were expended, even when we had voting machines that did not work?

MS. MILLER: I was not -- I can't talk about what they did previously. I can only talk about what we're doing now. I wasn't around for
that.

CHAIR BENNETT: Ms. Brizill, we've been here trying to answer your questions. Do you have additional questions, Ms. Brizill?

MS. BRIZILL: Yes, I do.

CHAIR BENNETT: And unfortunately, I'm going to have to limit your time. Would you please try and be succinct, Ms. Brizill?

MS. BRIZILL: I will try to be succinct if the answers are truthful and succinct.

CHAIR BENNETT: And you have an additional -- and you have another two minutes, Ms. Brizill.

MS. BRIZILL: You're going to limit the time now?

CHAIR BENNETT: Yes, ma'am, I am.

MS. BRIZILL: Under what rules? On what laws and rules are you going to limit my --

CHAIR BENNETT: Ms. Brizill, I'm going to limit the time under the rules of the Board.

So --
MS. BRIZILL: What rules of the Board? Can I see the written rules of the Board?

CHAIR BENNETT: So, you have two minutes, Ms. Brizill.

MS. STROUD: Yes, you can, Ms. Brizill.

CHAIR BENNETT: I'd be happy to present them to you.

MS. BRIZILL: Okay. I'd like a copy of the rules of the Board at this time.

CHAIR BENNETT: After the meeting is over, you will be handed -- you can have a copy. And they're on the website, too.

MS. BRIZILL: Can the Board tell me what Ken McGhie's position is currently at the Board?

MS. MILLER: His position --

MS. BRIZILL: I'd like the Chairman to answer the question.

MEMBER GILL: You know, well, before we go to this, so if someone has a problem with personnel, I think that's something that doesn't
need to be done at a hearing. Are we going to go
through every single employee and open it up and
allow citizens to ask for the judgment of
employees and salaries? It's all public. Why do
we have to go through a public process --

MS. BRIZILL: Mr. Gill, where is it
public? You fired Mr. McGhie, but you didn't
walk him out the door. Then, you hired Ms.
Stroud and you didn't do that in the public --

MEMBER GILL: I don't want --

MS. BRIZILL: I simply asked, because
he comes to work every day, I would like to know
what his position is.

CHAIR BENNETT: Would you tell Ms.
Brizill what Mr. McGhie's --

MS. MILLER: Election Management
Advisor is his title.

MS. BRIZILL: Election Management --

MS. MILLER: -- Advisor is his
position.

MEMBER GILL: I just think this is a
really bad precedent where people can walk in off
the street and start asking about people's employment.

MS. BRIZILL: People walking off the street?

CHAIR BENNETT: It's on the website.

Ms. Brizill, do you have any other questions?

MS. BRIZILL: Where is it on the website? Where is Mr. McGhie's new position on the website?

CHAIR BENNETT: Please take a look.

MS. MILLER: It would be on the org chart.

CHAIR BENNETT: It would be on the org chart.

Do you have any other questions, Ms. Brizill?

MS. BRIZILL: What is his salary?

CHAIR BENNETT: It's on the website, Ms. Brizill.

MS. BRIZILL: Are you giving your word that it's on the website?
MS. STROUD: All public salaries are on the public body information --

MS. BRIZILL: But it's not on the Board of Elections website.

CHAIR BENNETT: Well, it's not required to be.

MS. BRIZILL: So, I have to scroll through thousands of D.C. Government employees that's on the Mayor's site to find Mr. McGhie's salary?

MS. STROUD: And that is what you would have to do if you visited any agency site. It refers to that listing.

MS. BRIZILL: So, I am asking the Chairman of the Board --

CHAIR BENNETT: I don't recall --

MS. BRIZILL: Since you demoted him, what is his salary?

CHAIR BENNETT: I don't recall his salary, Ms. Brizill, but that's certainly available.

MS. BRIZILL: You made a decision to
demote him.

CHAIR BENNETT: I don't recall. I don't recall.

Do you have another question, Ms. Brizill? Your two minutes are just about up, ma'am.

MS. BRIZILL: Can you tell me what the name of the new attorney who was hired in the Office of Campaign Finance to do, oversee the Fair Elections Program?

MR. SANFORD: There is no new attorney hired in the Office of Campaign Finance for the Fair Elections Program.

MS. BRIZILL: I'm sorry?

MR. SANFORD: There is no new attorney hired in the Office of Campaign Finance for the Fair Elections Program.

MS. BRIZILL: So, what does Melinda Perry do?

MR. SANFORD: Hold on, please, Ms --

MS. BRIZILL: What does she do?

MR. SANFORD: Would you allow me to
finish --

MS. BRIZILL: Uh-hum.

MR. SANFORD: -- what I'm saying here?

The Office of the General Counsel provides the legal support for the Fair Elections Program.

There is no new attorney hired for the Fair Elections Program.

CHAIR BENNETT: Do you have another question, Ms. Brizill?

MS. BRIZILL: Are you on the record telling me that you did not hire a new attorney from New York to be the lead attorney in the Fair Elections Program?

MR. SANFORD: Absolutely, I'm on the record telling you that.

MS. BRIZILL: Thank you.

CHAIR BENNETT: Is there anything else, Ms. Brizill?

MS. BRIZILL: Mr. Sanford, can you tell me about the status of the lawsuit that was just completed regarding the Office of Campaign Finance and the charge that was upheld in
Superior Court regarding discrimination against
an employee by the Director of the Office of
Campaign Finance?

MR. SANFORD: I am not familiar with
that. We have not been served with that
information.

MS. BRIZILL: You're not aware of the
lawsuit brought by --

CHAIR BENNETT: He said he was not,
Ms. Brizill. Please stop harassing people.

MS. BRIZILL: I'm --

CHAIR BENNETT: Ms. Brizill, do you
have anything else?

MS. BRIZILL: Mr. Bennett --

CHAIR BENNETT: Do you have anything
else?

MS. BRIZILL: Mr. Bennett --

CHAIR BENNETT: Do you have anything
else, Ms. Brizill?

MS. BRIZILL: Mr. Bennett --

CHAIR BENNETT: Ms. Brizill, do you
have anything else?
MS. BRIZILL: I --

CHAIR BENNETT: Your time is up, ma'am.

MS. BRIZILL: On paper, on paper --

CHAIR BENNETT: Ma'am, your time is up.

MS. BRIZILL: -- you said you were an attorney.

This is not harassment.

CHAIR BENNETT: Ma'am, your time is up.

MS. BRIZILL: This is the public asking you questions.

CHAIR BENNETT: Ma'am, ma'am, your time is up. You're not going to sit here and act as if you are the prosecutor prosecuting people here. Your time is up, Ms. Brizill. Thank you very much.

MEMBER GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BENNETT: Ma'am, your time is up.

Are there any other public matters?
(No response.)
Okay.

MS. BRIZILL: I don't know, I don't
know --

CHAIR BENNETT: So, if not, this
meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:43 p.m., the meeting
was adjourned.)
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