Government Administration and Elections Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Friday, March 29, 2019

11:00 AM in Room 2B of the LOB

The meeting was called to order at [Click here and type time] by Chairman, Sen. Flexer M. S29.

The following committee members were present:

Senators: Flexer M. S29; Haskell W. S26; Maroney J. S14; Sampson R. S16

Representatives: Blumenthal M. 147; Fox D. 148; France M. 042; Haddad G. 054; Harding S. 107; Labriola D. 131; Mastrofrancesco G. 080; McCarthy Vahey C. 133; Perillo J. 113; Phipps Q. 100; Santiago H. 084; Winkler M. 056

Absent were:

Senators:

Representatives:

I. Sen. Flexer convened meeting at 11:08 and immediately recessed to go into caucus.

Meeting reconvened at 4:35 PM.

II. Remarks by the Chairs: There were no remarks by the chairs.

III. Sen. Flexer recognized Rep. Fox who made a motion to put the following items on the consent calendar: SB252, SB267, SB643, SB879, HB1092, HB1093, HB1094, HB1096, HB1102, HB1103, HB1105, HJ18, HB5816,
HB7210, HB6063, HB7383, HB7384, HB7386, HB7390, HB7391, SB1091, HB6666, HB7321.

Unanimous voice vote. Sen Flexer remarked that the votes would be held open thirty minutes after the close of the meeting.

33. **S.B. No. 682** (COMM) AN ACT CONCERNING STATE EMPLOYEE REPORTING OF WASTEFUL PRACTICES.

Motion made to JFS to floor: Rep. Fox, Seconded by Sen. Haskell.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco had concerns that the auditors said that they would need more help. Also she believes this reporting should be done by management and supervisors. She appreciates the efforts this bill makes.

Sen. Haskell remarked that the substitute language addresses the auditors' concerns and that state employees would report suggestions to their supervisors.

Sen. Sampson thanked his colleagues for their concerns. Although he doesn't think employees should receive incentives for what should be their job, he will be supporting the bill.

**Final vote tally: 15 Voting, 13 yea, 2 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.**

**Motion passed.**

42. **H.B. No. 7322** (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING BALLOT DESIGN.

Motion made to JF to the floor by Rep. Fox, Seconded by rep. Santiago.

Rep France understands that the intent of the bill is to prevent a mixup of ballots?

Sen. Flexer said yes.

Rep. France said that SOTS’s approval on this is only 10 days, he thinks this isn’t enough time, and the approval timeline should conform and be in sync with other bills.

**Final vote tally: 15 voting, 15 yea, 0 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.**

**Motion passed.**

1. **S.J. No. 14** (COMM) RESOLUTION PROPOSING A STATE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PERMIT EARLY VOTING.

Motion made to JF to the floor by Representative McCarthy Vahey, seconded by Rep. Fox.
Senator Sampson remarked that section 7a (line 7) gives language that the General Assembly “may provide”. He feels that this non-specific language is not appropriate for the state constitution. He said there have been a lot of changes to election laws recently, and that we should solve the problems that are currently happening before making more changes. He is in support of full access to the ballot while maintaining the integrity of the elections process. He questions if the resolution passes, does the legislature need to meet again to determine the time for early voting?

Sen. Flexer believes they could debate that.

Sen. Sampson asked if there is any thought as to how long?

Sen. Flexer replied that that’s not in this resolution.

Sen. Sampson questioned how long this would take to implement.

Sen. Flexer said this would be on the 2020 ballot if the legislature passes it by a ¾ majority, then the legislature can begin to create early voting.

Sen. Sampson remarked that this is very difficult to pass without specifics. He asked if this would require polling places to stay opened for the required time?

Sen. Flexer said this resolution doesn’t address that, rather only opens the door for debate.

Sen. Sampson said we need to figure out the ramifications. Remarked that there’s another bill (1046) and questioned if early voting and EDR could take place at the same time.

Sen. Flexer said this resolution doesn’t address that, but looks forward to debating that at the proper time.

Sen. Sampson said it would be prudent to realize the ramifications to decision making before the resolution is put before the people. He detailed the potential cost to the municipalities. He will be voting no on this resolution, but is not opposed to early voting per se.

Rep. Blumenthal commended the committee for taking up this issue. He did some research, and said that Connecticut is extremely restrictive. He believes this measure will give the people of CT a chance to decide whether to explore this avenue.

Rep. France echoed the concerns of Sen. Sampson. He is concerned this process is putting the cart before the horse. He believes the legislature could debate this issue before the resolutions passed so that people would know what early voting entails. He believes this is not appropriate to the Constitution to treat it like a book of statutes, although he supports early voting in general.
Final vote tally: 15 voting, 10 yea, 5 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.

5. **S.B. No. 642** (COMM) AN ACT CONCERNING SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS AND CAMPAIGN FINANCE.

Motion made to JF to the floor by Rep. Fox, seconded by Rep. McCarthy Vahey.

Sen. Sampson said that part of this bill hopes to regulate online platforms with a low threshold of revenue. He was concerned about overreaching and how SEEC can regulate or enforce this. Asked if it was enforceable?

Sen. Flexer said that she is happy to discuss the revenue portion to see if there is a threshold that Sen. Sampson is comfortable with. She said that SEEC would enforce this.

Sen. Sampson asked how CT could have the authority to regulate facebook, asked if we have that jurisdiction to do so. He said the candidate should obtain the information. He asked if this policy would discourage online platforms from working with CT campaigns? He doesn’t think this bill is well thought out.

Rep. France was curious about how an online platform can make an expenditure.

Sen. Flexer said that lines 11 – 14 say that ads are expenditures.

Rep. France asked how a website and not a person can make an expenditure?

Sen. Flexer said that online platforms are a place where the expenditure takes place.

Rep. France thinks the language makes a website making the expenditure. He doesn’t think that SEEC has the authority or how this bill is enforceable, and believes this is a Federal issue.

Rep. Perillo asked what this legislation is trying to do.

Sen. Flexer said it’s supposed to identify and define an online platform and see what qualifies as an ad, and requires points of contact for additional information.

Rep. Perillo asked what wouldn’t normally be available from a campaign that is available from the online platform?

Sen. Flexer said that this legislation doesn’t do what he describes, and that people need to know where the information is coming from.

Rep. Perillo asked what neutrally or evenly access means??
Sen. Flexer said if a candidate sees an ad for an opponent, they can demand equal access.

Rep. Perillo asked if there are any Federal regulations that require similar equal time?

Sen. Flexer didn’t know.

Rep. Perillo said it is very unclear what this bill is trying to do.

**Final vote tally: 15 voting, 10 yea, 5 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.**

**Motion passed.**

11. **S.B. No. 1095 (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING MUNICIPAL ETHICS.**

Rep. Fox made a motion to JF to the floor, Seconded by Sen. Maroney.

Rep. France asked if this bill establishes a minimum standard for each town to comply with across the state?

Sen. Flexer said yes it does.

Rep. France questioned whether the state has a concern/needs to create a mandate. Different towns have different ideas local to them. He said this is a heavy handed way of creating a mandate on towns. He also pointed out that there is no legislative oversight for the Office of Ethics. He agrees that towns should have codes of ethics, but that this isn’t the best way to go about it. He also points out that Boards of Education have a different responsibility.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco has concerns regarding the language. She is concerned about employees who are related to each other, and how it works if one relative is promoted over another. She also thinks this will be an issue with the unions.

**Final vote tally: 15 voting, 11 yea, 4 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.**

**Motion passed.**

16. **S.B. No. 1104 (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING GENDER NEUTRALITY IN THE STATE CONSTITUTION.**

Rep. Fox made a motion to JF to the floor, seconded by Sen. Maroney.

Sen. Sampson stated that the purpose of this bill is to review the constitution to remove all gendered language. He asked if there is something in the constitution that needs revising?

Sen. Flexer said that the purpose is to review the constitution and make it gender neutral.
Sen. Sampson asked if there’s something offensive prompted this bill?

Sen. Flexer stated that several sections in the constitution are not gender neutral, and read an example “we declare all men”.

Sen. Sampson said that can mean men or women. He asked if we are attempting to alter the English language by doing this, and are we blaming the drafters for using this language and penalizing them? He believes this is a non-issue, and doesn’t support rewriting our founding document.

**Final vote tally: 15 voting, 12 yea, 3 nay, 0 abstain, 0 absent and not voting.**

**Motion passed.**

18. **S.B. No. 1107 (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING THE TERMS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CONNECTICUT TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND CONSTRUCTION INVOLVING HISTORIC STRUCTURES.**

Rep. Fox made the motion to JFS to the floor, seconded by Sen. Haskell.

Rep. France asked to have it summarized as to why we are changing the protocol for retaining the history of a town and usurping local control.

Sen. Flexer replied that this isn’t altering any process in a municipality but rather changing state statute.

Rep. France said that this is a heavy hand by the state when municipalities haven’t exhausted all the avenues yet.

Sen. Flexer said that the process right now concerns state regulations and doesn’t change the local process.

Rep. France has concerns about the changes being made and how that would affect local properties.

Sen. Haskell has heard from constituents regarding Section 2, and says the language has been changed to reflect their concerns.

Rep. Perillo said that Section 2 is so limited it might be exclusionary. He asked why 10 years for distressed communities?

Sen. Flexer said there is probably a difference between lengths of time. Maybe there is less hope when more time is spent as a distressed community. A brief amount of time may give more options.

Rep. Perillo asked why the population threshold.

Sen. Flexer is open to hearing other population numbers.
Rep. Perillo says he represents over 40k people and doesn’t qualify as a distressed community and would like to see an expansion.

Sen. Flexer is happy to talk further about this.

Sen. Maroney expressed concern that this would have unintended consequences regarding opportunity zones.

**Final vote tally: 15 voting, 9 yea, 6 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.**

**Motion passed.**

25. **H.B. No. 6742** (COMM) AN ACT CONCERNING HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND STATE CONTRACTS AND THE LICENSING OF ESTHETICIANS, NAIL TECHNICIANS AND EYELASH TECHNICIANS.

Rep. Fox made a motion to JFS to the floor, seconded by Rep. McCarthy Vahey.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked to have the JFS language summarized.

Sen. Flexer said that Section 1 is removed, that DAS said it was unnecessary, and that other changes regard training thresholds of licensing requirements.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked if the hours had changed?

Sen. Flexer said yet, it’s different hours for different technicians.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco pointed out that the title of this bill has not been changed.

Sen. Flexer said LCO makes the titles and the title will be likely to change due to the removal of the section.

LCO said that the titles of bills are their purview and reflect the contents of the bill.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked if the title of this bill could be changed and why it hasn’t been changed already?

LCO responded that it was a clerical error and will be updated.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco said nail technicians are often young women and single mothers and this could be a hardship for small businesses. She also objects to the original title.

Sen. Sampson will be voting no, he doesn’t believe this committee should have this bill and he knows nothing about these issues.
Rep Perillo has the same concerns as Sen. Sampson. He says all these concerns fall within the public health statutes. He said the Committee on Public Health doesn’t support this bill, and wondered why the GAE Committee has the bill.

Sen. Flexer said it had been sent to Labor, then to GAE because of Section 1, which was within the GAE Committee’s cognizance. She said that people in the industry helped with this language.

Final vote tally: 15 voting, 10 yea, 5 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.

Motion passed.

32. **H.B. No. 5504** (COMM) AN ACT CONCERNING THE NET ECONOMIC VALUE OF CONTRACTS.

Motion was made by Rep. Fox to JF to the floor, seconded by Sen. Maroney.

Rep. France asked who would determine the net economic value and how would it be applied?

Sen. Flexer turned the microphone over to Rep. Fox.

Rep Fox said the DAS Commissioner would determine the net economic value.

Rep. France asked what expertise does the commissioner have and what model would he use?

Rep. Fox said the RFP process is already in place.

Rep. France said we’re going to establish value beyond what’s currently done. Asked if there is a current model and how will we know if it’s equitable and fair?

Rep. Fox said line 186 says that DAS gets to determine the methodology.

Rep. France said there is no legislative oversight over DAS, there could be legal jeopardy.

Rep. Fox asked if he is asking about an established procedure.

Rep. France said he is looking at the risk to the state if it’s deemed unfair or inequitable. He says the legislature doesn’t get the approval.

Rep. Fox says the process provides that there would be further review.

Rep. France still has concerns and is not aware that any other state does this. He’ll be voting no.
Sen. Sampson thinks this is a terrible bill. He said we want to find ways to encourage economic growth in the state. He says this bill creates a process where the executive director can award bids regardless of what costs are. He has concerns about the growth of government and the opportunity for cronyism and corruption. This bill also gives the DOT and UConn this authority and can be abused.

**Final vote tally:** 15 voting, 10 yea, 5 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.

**Motion passed.**

34. **S.B. No. 1042** (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING THE AUTOMATIC DISMISSAL OF STATE ELECTIONS ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION COMPLAINTS.

Sen. Maroney made the motion to JF to the floor, seconded by Rep. Fox.

Sen. Sampson said this bill would do away with legislation that was passed bipartisan in 2017. He wonders why this bill is before the committee at all? Are there any cases that are over 3 years old?

Sen. Flexer said the bill comes from SEEC to make the 2017 bill more workable. SEEC didn’t outline the older cases.

Sen. Sampson is aware of several cases and is aware of SEEC no probably cause cases where they try to settle. He said that people have a right to a speedy resolution, and is concerned with this bill that there may be more cases that remain unresolved.

Rep. France noted that the 2017 bill has barely gotten to the one year deadline where a case would have to be dropped. He says there is no data to back up this new bill, and thinks that this bill is premature, and that passage should wait another year or two.

**Final vote tally:** 15 voting, 10 yea, 5 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.

36. **H.B. No. 5820** (COMM) AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO STUDY RANKED-CHOICE VOTING.

Rep. Fox made a motion to JF to the floor, seconded by Sen. Maroney.

Sen. Sampson asked to have ranked choice voting (RCV) explained.

Sen. Flexer believes that the testimony heard would set up several variations of RCV. This bill is a task force to study them.

Sen. Sampson was curious as to why a task force would be convened to study the issue and not study the constitutionality of it.

Sen. Flexer said the task force would study the feasibility of RCV.
Sen. Sampson read Article III, Section 7 of the constitution and said it seems pretty clear.

Sen. Flexer said this could also be considered by the task force.

Final vote tally: 15 voting, 10 yea, 5 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.

Motion passed.

37. H.B. No. 5418 (COMM) AN ACT IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STATE CONTRACTING STANDARDS BOARD.

Motion made to JFS to the floor by Rep. McCarthy Vahey, seconded by Sen. Maroney.

Rep. France questioned whether the JFS language removed the judiciary and legislative branch from the bill.

Rep. Fox said yes it did, there was a concern about the separation of powers issue.

Rep. France said he wanted that on record.

Final vote tally: 15 voting, 15 yea, 0 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.

Motion passed.

35. S.B. No. 1046 (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING ELECTION DAY REGISTRATION IN POLLING PLACES.

Motion was made to JFS to the floor by Sen. Maroney, seconded by Rep. McCarthy Vahey.

Rep. Perillo asked if any analysis has been done for cost to the municipalities.

Sen. Flexer said no official analysis has been done. She said it would allow voter processing to be easier so the cost would be negative.

Sen. Sampson asked how many polling places are in CT.

Sen. Flexer didn’t know.

Sen. Sampson was told between 700 and 750. He said this means towns would add potentially more polling locations. He pointed out that the committee should look at the solution offered by ROVAC which would allow SOTS to certify the sites and would target the problem areas. He asked how many staff are required for EDR.

Sen. Flexer said no staff are required.
Sen. Sampson said this bill may do the opposite of its intention, where municipalities may end up with fewer polling locations. The bill could create the problem it’s intended to solve.

Rep. France said that there is another bill before the committee, and that they’ve heard a lot from multiple stakeholders, with two opposing viewpoints. The ROVAC plan would deal with the problems where they are. He questioned why the committee didn’t come up with one solution. He said this bill would be a huge fiscal impact and is very disappointed.

**Final vote tally:** 15 voting, 10 yea, 5 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.

**Motion passed.**

35. **H.B. No. 5505 (COMM) AN ACT CONCERNING THE UPDATING OF STATE FORMS AND APPLICATIONS TO INCLUDE A NONBINARY GENDER OPTION.**

Motion was made to JFS to the floor by Sen. Maroney and seconded by Rep. Blumenthal.

Sen. Sampson has concerns about the cost to state agencies to redo all the state forms.

Rep. Fox said the cost was limited and would require a small programming cost.

Sen. Sampson said we didn’t know, but thought there would be a cost. Asked where “x” as a gender identification came from.

Rep Fox said that members of the community wanted this designation.

Sen. Sampson understands the desire for people to be recognized. HE isn’t sure if this is the proper technique. He is concerned that “x” will be obsolete at some point, and said that the state shouldn’t be interested in gender anyway. He suggested modifying the documents to not require a gender field be filled out, and made a motion to pass an amendment to reflect this. The motion was seconded by Rep. France.

The clerk called the roll for the amendment; the amendment failed.

Sen. Sampson said he had hoped that the amendment would be friendly. He is concerned that the third option of “x” would not fix the issue. He said it could be a sizeable expense reaching across several agencies.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked if the “x” could be clarified.

Rep. Fox said that this is how the members of this community identify themselves.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked if this was the equivalent of Mr. or Mrs.
Rep. Fox said it’s a non-binary gender, not a prefix.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked if it would be a check box.

Rep. Fox said yes.

Rep. Mastrofrancensco asked when this would be used.

Rep. Fox said it would be on any state form.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked if someone would check “x” if they didn’t want to disclose their gender.

Rep. Fox said that members of the non-binary community would check “x”.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco said she thinks the cost would be high.

Senator Maroney asked if the state would reprint all the existing forms.

Rep. Fox said the forms would be updated going forward.

Sen. Maroney clarified that this wouldn’t be retroactive?

Rep Fox said that’s his understanding.

**Final vote tally:** 15 voting, 11 yea, 4 nay, 0 abstain, 1 absent and not voting.

Motion passed.

41. **H.B. No. 7321** (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING ELECTIONS AND SECURITY.

Motion was made to JFS to the floor by Sen. Maroney and seconded by Rep. Santiago.

Sen. Sampson asked if it was known what the cost of the cybersecurity role would be.

Sen. Flexer said it’s in the SOTS budget.

Sen. Sampson asked if the cost is significant.

Sen. Flexer said it is one person to serve in this role.

Sen. Sampson said that’s assuming the budget passes. He said our voting system is self-contained and doesn’t know what role a cybersecurity person would play. He said that section 2 limits voter data to the date of birth. He is concerned that this won’t protect anyone, and that that voter data isn’t often used for fraud. He is not satisfied that this would protect anyone. Also there are many exceptions about who would get the information. He is concerned
about the limits of who receives the information and who they’re allowed to share it with.

Rep. France said section 4a refers to two memory cards, and asked if tabulators have two slots for cards?

Sen. Flexer said one is for the tabulator and one is for security analysis.

Rep. France asked if one is sent off for analysis?

Sen. Flexer said she believes so.

Rep. France is concerned that there isn’t a policy in place.

Final vote tally: 14 voting, 10 yea, 4 nay, 0 abstain, 2 absent and not voting.

43. H.B. No. 6047 (COMM) AN ACT CONCERNING BALLOTS USED AT POLLING PLACES THAT SERVE MULTIPLE VOTING DISTRICTS.

Motion was made to JF to the floor by Rep. Fox and seconded by Sen. Maroney.

Rep. Perillo asked if this bill arises from what happened in Stratford?

Sen. Flexer said yes it does.

Rep Perillo said that they got a lot of testimony on the contested elections committee that using different colored ballots are standard, and that the ballots in Stratford were white because of the delay in printing. What would happen if the registrar was unable to print in color?

Sen. Flexer said they would be in violation. She also said that other bills would give an earlier deadline.

Rep. Perillo said the issue wasn’t the fault of the registrar. He asked if candidates would have a cause of action?

Sen. Flexer said this bill doesn’t address that.

Rep. Perillo asked how this would be enforced and what would be the penalties?

Sen. Flexer said this bill doesn’t address that.

Rep. France said he has concerns about enforcement, election results, and that a candidate could bring action.

Final vote tally: 14 voting, 12 yea, 2 nay, 0 abstain, 2 absent and not voting.
44. **H.B. No. 5817 (COMM) AN ACT CONCERNING OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL CHECKERS IN POLLING PLACES.**

Motion was made to JF to the floor by Sen. Haskell and seconded by Sen. Maroney.

Sen. Sampson said he has no objections to the bill, but the loud tone is not identified. He doesn’t believe this changes anything.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked what prompted the bill?

Rep. Fox said there was an issue where unofficial checkers were unable to hear the voters checking in.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked how this would be monitored and who would determine that it was being done?

Rep. Fox said that this bill looks to make sure checkers say it loud and clear.

Rep. Santiago said it’s sad that names can’t be heard, and that the moderator should make the determination.

**Final vote tally: 14 voting, 14 yea, 0 nay, 0 abstain, 2 absent and not voting.**

**Motion passed.**

48. **H.B. No. 7213 (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING ELECTORAL PRIVILEGES OF CERTAIN PAROLEES AND CHALLENGERS IN THE POLLING PLACE.**

Sen. Sampson asked if challengers are being removed?

Rep. Fox said they’re still in the bill.

Sen. Sampson asked what type of population of parolees?

Sen. Flexer said that only parolees are included.

Sen. Sampson asked if this includes those on special parole?

Sen. Flexer said the language doesn’t speak to people on special parole.

Sen. Sampson asked if they would be included since they were not separated?

Sen. Flexer said the language doesn’t reference them at all.

LCO clarified that the bill just says those upon release from confinement, and can’t said for certain regarding those on special parole.
Sen. Sampson asked if voting rights were restored the moment of release of did the parole need to reapply?

Sen. Flexer said they have to be released from confinement.

Sen. Sampson said they might not have completed their full sentence.

Sen. Flexer said she would be open to having conversations regarding his concerns.

Sen. Sampson said it’s not clear in the language in the bill if voting rights are lost due to a crime, then the full sentence needs to be satisfied.

Final vote tally: 14 voting, 10 yea, 4 nay, 0 abstain, 2 absent and not voting.

Motion passed.

55. S.B. No. 25 (COMM) AN ACT RESTORING ELECTORAL PRIVILEGES TO FELONY CONVICTS WHO ARE ON PAROLE.

Motion made to JF to the floor by Rep. McCarthy Vahey, seconded by Sen. Maroney.

Sen. Sampson noted his feelings are the same as on the previous bill.

Final vote tally: voting 14, 10 yea, 4 nay, 0 abstain, 2 absent and not voting.

Motion passed.

49. S.B. No. 266 (COMM) AN ACT REQUIRING POLLING PLACES AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

Motion made to JFS to the floor by Rep. Fox, seconded by Sen. Maroney.

Rep. France asked if there’s anything currently preventing registrars from having polling places at universities.

Sen. Flexer says this bill makes it crystal clear that they can.

Rep. France asked the basis for selecting the number and type of students.

Den. Flexer said 3000 was determined to be a good threshold and the students would have to be residential.

Rep. France has a concern as to why we need this when many polling places are close to school campuses already.

Rep. McCarthy Vahey said she is sympathetic to the costs to small towns, but still believes in creating access.
Final vote tally: 14 voting, 10 yea, 4 nay, 0 abstain, 2 absent and not voting.

Motion passed.

2. **S.B. No. 24** (COMM) AN ACT CONCERNING AUTOMATIC VOTER REGISTRATION AT CERTAIN STATE AGENCIES.


Sen. Sampson had concerns about the way this bill is drafted. He supports access to voting. He said the issue is that we need to preserve the veracity of elections and only register people who are eligible to vote. He said this bill is willfully negligent, pointing out that the motor voter act required the person registering to attest to their eligibility, but that this bill doesn’t do that. He also said it includes many state agencies, but asked why the emphasis is on the benefits agencies, and not agencies that issue pistol and hunting permits. He then asked if we needed this bill when participation is at record highs. He is concerned that people’s faith in the process is being eroded, and is concerned with the costs associated with this, as it would require new forms and computer systems. He stated he has issues with automatic registration at colleges and universities. He asked if other states would be notified, and what about non-citizen students? He expressed concern about the committee pushing all these bills through without having one plan. He pointed out in Section 1 (lines 59 – 62) that the attestation may be waived by a commissioner at an agency. He wanted to know why this done. He also stated that for those who have opted out, they would be opted back in whenever they renewed at an agency.

Rep. France asked that along with auto-registration, there is a provision that absolves the state if they remove someone from the rolls. How would the elector know they had been removed?

Sen. Flexer said the elector would know when they went to vote, or they could check online.

Rep. France said if the voter’s status is removed without the voter's knowledge, they wouldn’t think to look and could be disenfranchised.

Sen. Flexer said she takes his concerns seriously and would be happy to look at them.

Final vote tally: 14 voting, 10 yea, 4 nay, 0 abstain, 2 absent and not voting.

53. **S.B. No. 1038** (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DUE TO AN EMPLOYER OTHER THAN THE STATE UNDER THE STATE CODE OF ETHICS.

Motion made to JF to the floor by Sen. Maroney, Seconded by Rep. Fox.
No discussion.

Final vote tally: 14 voting, 14 yea, 0 nay, 0 abstain, 0 absent and not voting.

Sen. Flexer recessed the meeting until 8:15 pm at which time the votes would be closed and the meeting adjourned. The next meeting will be held on April 1.

______________________________  ______________________________
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______________________________  ______________________________
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