1	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA * * * *
3	
4	Budget Hearing Pennsylvania Department of State
5	* * * *
6	Appropriations Committee
7	
8	Main Capitol Building Majority Caucus Room 140
9	Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
10	Wednesday, February 19, 2020 - 10:00 a.m.
11	000
12	MAJORITY MEMBERS PRESENT:
13	Honorable George Dunbar, Acting Majority Chairman Honorable Rosemary Brown
14	Honorable Lynda Schlegel-Culver Honorable Sheryl Delozier
15	Honorable Jonathan Fritz Honorable Matt Gabler
16	Honorable Keith Greiner Honorable Seth Grove
17	Honorable Marcia Hahn Honorable Doyle Heffley
18	Honorable Lee James Honorable John Lawrence
19	Honorable Jason Ortitay Honorable Clint Owlett
20	Honorable Chris Quinn Honorable Greg Rothman
21	Honorable James Struzzi Honorable Jesse Topper
22	Honorable Jeff Wheeland Honorable Ryan Warner
23	Honorable Martina White
24	1300 Garrison Drive, York, PA 17404
25	717.764.7801

```
1
      MINORITY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
2
      Honorable Matt Bradford, Minority Chairman
      Honorable Donna Bullock
 3
      Honorable Morgan Cephas
      Honorable Carolyn Comitta
 4
      Honorable Austin Davis
      Honorable Maria Donatucci
 5
      Honorable Elizabeth Fiedler
      Honorable Marty Flynn
 6
      Honorable Edward Gainey
      Honorable Patty Kim
7
      Honorable Stephen Kinsey
      Honorable Leanne Krueger
      Honorable Stephen McCarter
8
      Honorable Benjamin Sanchez
 9
      Honorable Peter Schweyer
10
      NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
11
12
      Honorable Harry Readshaw, Majority Professional
        Licensure Committee Chairman
13
      Honorable Kevin Boyle, Minority State Government
        Committee Chairman
14
      Honorable Cris Dush
      Honorable Curt Sonney
15
      Honorable Tom Mehaffie
      Honorable Frank Farry
16
      Honorable Frank Ryan
      Honorable Mark Gillen
17
      Honorable Joe Ciresi
      Honorable Joe Webster
18
      Honorable Brian Simms
      Honorable Joe Hohenstein
19
      Honorable Pam DeLissio
      Honorable Kevin Boyle
      Honorable Chris Sainato
20
      Honorable Ed Neilson
21
      Honorable Patrick Harkins
      Honorable Gerald Mullery
22
23
24
25
```

1	STAFF ATTENDANCE:
2	
3	David Donley Majority Executive Director
4	Ritchie LaFaver
5	Deputy Executive Director
6	Ann Baloga
7	Minority Executive Director
8	Tara Trees
9	Minority Chief Counsel
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Key Reporters

1	INDEX OF TESTIFIERS
2	TESTIFIERS
3	
4	DEPARTMENT OF STATE
5	Kathy Boockvar, Secretary
6	Jonathan Marks, Deputy Secretary Elections & Commissions
7	Kalonji Johnson, Acting Commissioner Bureau of Professional & Occupational Affairs
8	Kim Mattis, Director
9	Bureau of Finance & Operations
10	
11	
12	
13	SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY
14	(See other submitted testimony and handouts online.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS
21	
22	PAGE LINE PAGE LINE
23	77 7-9 127 24- 128 4-8
24	
25	

ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Good morning, everyone. As you can tell, I'm not Chairman Saylor. I'm Representative Dunbar and I'm standing in for Stan who is a little bit under -- a lot bit under the weather you could say. I feel for Minority Chairman Bradford who had to sit next to him yesterday, so I'm worried about maybe putting a screen up between us here, if he's a carrier of the Coronavirus.

Welcome. This is the hearing for the Department of State, and Secretary Kathy Boockvar is here with us. And before we get started, I wanted you, if you would be able to introduce all your people with you before we swear everybody in.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Sure.

Good morning, everybody. I'm Kathy
Boockvar. And with me is Kimberly Mattis, who is
our Director of Finance and Operations; Kalonji
Johnson who is our Acting Commissioner of BPOA,
Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs;
and Jonathan Marks who's our Deputy Secretary for
Elections and Commissions.

ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: And we'd like to swear everybody in. So if everybody is going to be testifying, please stand and raise

2.1

1	your right hand.
2	(Testifiers were sworn en masse).
3	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: So
4	sworn. Please have a seat.
5	We're not We don't We haven't been
6	doing opening statements. We're gonna go directly
7	to questions.
8	But before we do, I just want to
9	introduce our Democrat Professional License
LO	Committee Chairman Henry Readshaw who's with us,
L1	and our Democratic State Government Chairman Kevin
L2	Boyle who's with us. Thank you for joining us. I
L3	also wanted to recognize Representative Dush who's
L 4	joined us.
L5	Before we get started, Representative
L 6	Kinsey had a special announcement.
L7	REPRESENTATIVE KINSEY: Thank you,
L8	Mr. Chairman.
L 9	To all my colleagues and folks that are
20	gathered here, we just want to really give a warm
21	welcome and happy birthday wish to Representative
22	Ed Gainey who's birthday is today.
23	(Applause).
24	REPRESENTATIVE GAINEY: Thank you,
25	Mr. Chairman.

ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Happy birthday, Ed. And we will start with questions from Representative Lawrence.

REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, I want to get right into the situation regarding the upcoming 2020 election. As we know, Governor Wolf chose to unilaterally decertify every voting machine in Pennsylvania recently, even machines like the ones used in Chester County that had Scantron-style paper ballots.

A June 2019 Associated Press article by Marc Levy quoted the Governor saying that the integrity of Pennsylvania's elections is everyone's responsibility. Later in the article a nameless source from the Governor's Office issued the somewhat menacing statement that, if they, the counties, elect not to support protecting Pennsylvania's votes, Governor Wolf will assess the best path forward for the Commonwealth.

Last year the Department of State held an event at the Farm Show Complex where voting machine vendors could hock their wares to county officers dutifully looking to buy new voting

2.1

machines. I went to that event, and I tried many of the machines myself. In my view, the clear choice was the Scantron-style machine that Chester County uses. Many of the other machines required multiple input steps or required the voter to go through multiple touch screens to locate their candidate for a given race.

Unfortunately, the Governor and the

Department of State, after mandating counties to

buy new machines, gave lousy guidance regarding

what new machines counties should purchase.

Philadelphia and other counties purchased expensive

new voting machines that are now being challenged

in court.

Just yesterday, Madam Secretary, you were in federal court on this very matter.

According to Emily Previti's PA Post report this morning, the judge asked how -- asked you how voting would proceed in the presidential election if he invalidated Philadelphia's voting machines. As the top election official in this state, your response was, I don't know.

To summarize, nine months out from the most consequential election of our lifetime in a swing state with the eyes of the nation watching,

2.1

there is still no consensus on the voting machines that the state prefers to see counties use. As the top election official in the state, you told the judge yesterday that, quote, chaos would ensue, end quote, if he ruled against your position. Hardly a reassuring statement.

Madam Secretary, what can you say to this Committee and the people of Pennsylvania to give us some comfort that on election night, this November, Pennsylvania will not be the next version of the Iowa caucus debacle?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you for your question, Representative.

So, I want to start out by saying, I was on the stand for three and a half hours yesterday, and Miss Previti's article discussed about one minute of that three and a half hours. So, there were lots of other things said.

What the judge asked me, and which is not clear from the reporting in the article, was, if I were to say it needed to be decertified before the April 28th primary, what would be the circumstances? So I just want to be clear, the article was not.

So, for the primary -- And I have to

say, after that discussion, I'm very happy to say it was effective, because the plaintiffs actually withdrew their request that this happened before the primary, which was the point of discussing the burden on Pennsylvania; three counties, not just Philadelphia, who were planning to use this for the primary. I'm happy to say the end result is that they're not seeking that, which I did say would cause chaos if it was decertified before the primary.

For the general, that was a different discussion, and that's not clear in the article. So, first of all, there is -- You asked me a series of questions. I think the --

We, in Pennsylvania, under Pennsylvania law, every voting system that's certified needs to be certified by both the Federal Government and the State Government. We created -- In 2018, we created a whole host of new security tests and accessibility testing that every system, in order to be certified in Pennsylvania, need to go through. We've now certified eight systems, one of which is used, is the one being challenged in court.

The Department of State, the Elections

2.1

Assistance Commission by Federal Government, a whole handful, maybe half a dozen or more other states use these systems, including states that have at least, you know, just as secured testing as we do. So we have full confidence in every single system.

In Pennsylvania and, frankly, the fact the counties use different systems, actually adds to our security posture because, if there were one system that was vulnerable, having more than one and having, you know --

We have maybe between 20 and 25 different configurations of systems being used in counties across the Commonwealth. That's a strain. That's actually a strain.

So I'm happy to answer kind of specific additional questions. But, overall, we have -- we have confidence in both defeating the challenge that was brought yesterday. We have confidence in the security of elections. We have confidence of every single system being selected by a county.

REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Madam

Secretary, according again to this article, the

Department of State Attorney Timothy Gates

testified yesterday, no one ever made it a point to

2.1

nail down which phrase or definition to use to refer to the paper that voting machine should produce. Now, that's a startling statement.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR:

2.1

Since it seems, Madam Secretary, that it was up in the air in the court yesterday, can you tell me, what is your definition of a paper ballot?

I can,

Representative. And again, I'm sure -- I'm guessing that every person in this room has been in the circumstance where you know you said one thing, or maybe three and a half hours of things, and the way it's quoted in the paper is not accurate.

So, our settlement agreement from

November of 2018, was explicitly clear. And what

it said was, the parties agree that all systems

certified in Pennsylvania will have the vote

recorded on paper; that the vote will be verifiable

by the voter, and that it must be an auditable

paper record of the vote. So those were three

explicit definitions of what every system had to

include.

And the fourth was, the parties agree that the path the Department had already set, which started in April of 2018, saying that all the counties needed to upgrade, as you referred to

earlier, that that would -- that the parties would agree to continue on that path.

So the settlement agreement is explicit, and the parties agreed to it. I was at that settlement conference, and I can tell you a hundred percent there was agreement.

So, is Jill Stein trying to come back in and make herself relevant again? Yes, she's suing us. Do I think that there's any validity to that challenge? I do not.

ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank you, Secretary. Thank you, Representative.

I was a little remiss--I'm new at this job--and I started without giving the Minority Chairman an opportunity. But I think he did want to make some comments now.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: Thank you, Interim Chair. I appreciate the opportunity.

Real quick. Rather than make opening remarks, I just wanna kind of settle a little bit of the history based on the gentleman's comments. I think it's important to have a good feel of how we wound up with the actions that the Governor was necessitated to take in light of what happened in the 2016 presidential election.

2.1

1 At that time I think there is largely a 2 bipartisan consensus from America's professional security and intelligence communities that there 3 was foreign interference in our election. a statement of fact. Is that a fair assessment? 5 6 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yes. MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: Was there a concern that our election system, because of it 8 being connected to the Internet in some way, was 10 possible it could be hacked by a foreign interference? 11 12 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Well, more so that there was no paper record. So, there was no 13 14 ability to know whether it was being hacked or otherwise interfered with? 15 16 MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: 17 And what steps did the Governor take in 18 order to alleviate the concern of foreign 19 interference, a hacking, or to really ensure credibility that there would be some kind of paper 20 2.1 backup for our election systems? 22 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you for that 23 question. You know, this is -- Pennsylvania was 24 25 one of the last states to move in this direction,

so this had been a national, as you said, since 2016. Since late 2016, it's been a national movement in this direction.

2.1

Administration, which was in March of 2018, I think we were one of only 12 states remaining that did not have the ability to audit paper records or to have the voters verify the records. So, the Governor, back in February of 2018, first issued a directive via the Department of State requiring that any new systems procured in Pennsylvania use -- purchase systems that had a voter verifiable paper trail so that it could be audited; so that the voter can make sure that the vote actually recorded was the vote that they -- that they intended.

So, in April of 2018, we got to where the Department of State via the Governor and the Department of State set the timeline that every county should replace their aging voting systems, which were, you know, at minimum 12, 15 years old; in some cases 30 years old, using technology that existed before the very first iPhone, and everybody replace their system to new systems that had voter verifiable paper trails. And this was consistent,

as I said, with nearly every state across the

country except for a dozen. Department of

Homeland Security, under President Trump, the U.S.

Senate Intelligence Committee, U.S. House

Intelligence Committee, really, every computer

science national security expert has agreed that

this was where we needed to go. And so, that's the

path that we've been on.

Did that answer your question?

MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: I believe it does, because I think that little bit of history needs to be stated. Otherwise, this discussion I think can kind of veer down a road that, frankly, is not helpful.

I think people need to understand this is a process. Obviously, this Legislature has thrown another curve ball in terms of Act 77, which is a tremendous opportunity, but is obviously in a very compressed period of time.

Rather than me taking up a lot of time here and using my question time, I just want to thank you, recognizing that your department has been thrown quite a bit from the Legislature, from the Federal Government, and, obviously, from external powers beyond our control. But I just

2.1

1 want to thank you for coming here today and laying 2 out what activities your Department's doing to secure our election. Thank you. 3 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: 4 Thank vou, Chairman. 5 6 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank 7 you, Mr. Chairman. Next will be Representative Rothman. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 11 I think I need to ask a follow-up 12 question to the ranking member's question. Are you 13 saying there was foreign interference in 14 Pennsylvania's election 2016? 15 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: No. Thank you for 16 asking that qualification. So, what happened in 2016 is, I think 17 18 the best analogy is, picture if you're a bad actor, 19 which in this case we understand to be foreign 20 governments, picture if you're a thief wannabe and 21 you would go around the neighborhood and you would 22 check to see which houses have unlocked doors and 23 windows. You're gonna look for the easiest target. But when you find a locked window or a locked door, 24

you're gonna go on to the next house.

So Russia -- The information that we got after the fact was that Russia went around and tried the doors and windows of at least 21 states, of which Pennsylvania was one of them. Good news is they found our doors and windows locked. So they moved on to the next one. So there was no interference that happened.

Was there attempted interference?

Absolutely. That's -- The Federal Government has said that they have tried it in the past, they're gonna try it again, which is why we have spent so much time in Pennsylvania really shoring up our election security collaborations, our election security forces at every level, and we have --

I'm happy to talk to you about all our different, you know, resources in place. Would that be helpful?

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Sure. I do have your testimony, too. I appreciate what you did in 2019, and you're planning to do in 2020. I do have a question, though.

In your testimony on page 5, you're talking about audits, and it says: Audits can confirm that the voting systems tabulated the paper ballots accurately enough that a full-hand count

would produce the same outcome.

2.1

what is your definition of accurately enough? I'm a math person, so 1 plus 1 should equal 2. I would expect that accurately enough would be 100 percent accurate.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, yeah. And that's sort of technical language that I guess if you -- I don't know if you're a statistician and I'm not. I'll start with that.

So, basically, statistically significant is what the academics use. And so, risk-limiting audits which is what we piloted in Mercer County and Philadelphia in November, it is a type of audit, post-election audit, which is considered enhanced, where, based on how much a winner won by or a loser lost by, they can determine what the -- what the -- what the calculations are needed, how many ballots are needed to come to a statistically significant result, that would be the same -- that would reach the same result as if you had done a complete recount.

So that, you don't have to recount a hundred percent of the ballots. The statisticians can actually plug in algorithms based on how different the race was. If it was 5 percent or

10 percent it could say to a, you know, whatever, 96 percent, reasonable degree of statistical certainty. And as a math person, you could probably explain this better than I can; that the outcome of the election was correct.

So, the language in the -- in the testimony, you know, was probably taken without that full context.

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: So to be clear, we're talking about a test. And so, at some point in your testimony you talk about how we're gonna base -- we're gonna look at the actual results and compare it to a model showing what the results should be. But that -- that's not -- that's --

The data coming in will affect the outcome. So, who's determining what the outcome should be before the outcome takes place?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So this is --

So, on election night, obviously, all the results get tabbed, so this is not -- this is not gonna take the place of any of the normal tabulation. So, on Election Day, votes, whether they're done at the polling place, whether they're done by mail, all get tabulated. The results are published as always, like they always will be.

2.1

What currently the Pennsylvania statutes include a statutory 2 percent audit or statistical recount which is flat. It's 2 percent or 2000 votes, whichever is less. And there's pretty much no guidance to the counties how to choose where you pull from. It's old, right? It's not -- It's not statistic. It doesn't use statistics of significance. It doesn't take into account, you know, lots of different factors.

So, over the last decade or so, statisticians, mathematicians, election folks, computer scientists have been working on improving those models so that, again, rather than just say 2 percent or 2000 votes, which has no logical ability to prove to us statistical significance that the outcome of the -- of the election was correct, they've actually developed models with which to do that.

And so, we're -- we've been looking at those models. We have this statewide post-election audit work group that includes six counties from across the state, small, medium, and large. It includes Department of State representatives. It includes some experts, national experts on post-election audits. We had the National Council of

2.1

State Legisla -- the NCSL, who has a lot of good information about what's going on across the country, come and present.

So we've been looking at models to help, again, not take the place of the count, but add assurance that the count that was reported is accurate. Does that make sense? And then, if the results of the audit don't confirm that the results match what the audit says, then a full recount would be undertaken.

REPRESENTATIVE ROTHMAN: Thank you for your time. My time is up. Thank you.

It's just a little concerning that we're gonna allow a model when we just should look at the results. The results are results. If you have paper ballots, we should do a paper recount. So that's -- what triggers it is, as I understand that.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: And none of that would take the place of the results, a hundred percent. The results are the results, and that's a hundred percent.

 $\label{eq:representative rothman: Thank you.} % \end{substitute{0.5em} % }% \end{sub$

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you.

ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank you, Representative.

And I did want to mention that we've been joined by Chairman Curt Sonney and Representative Mehaffie.

Next will be Austin Davis.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you.

Madam Secretary, I'm over here. Thank you for being with us today.

Act 77 allocated around roughly \$90 million to reimburse counties for 60 percent of their costs for new voting machines. And I just wanted to ask, is that the only funding available to counties, or are there other various sources of funding that they're gonna be able to tap into as we move forward?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you for that question.

Yeah. So there's various sources of funding that are going to the counties on various pieces of the election security puzzle. So, for example, in 2018, the Federal Government allocated \$380 million nationwide, of which Pennsylvania got 14.15 million, and we gave a hundred percent. We, being the Department of State, gave a hundred

percent of that to the counties. So the counties got, depending on what system they chose, anywhere between about, I would say between 10 and 18 percent of their costs came from those dollars alone. And the \$90 million from the bond funding under Act 77 will cover approximately 60 percent as well.

And on top of that, we just, from the Federal Government, got a new allocation of a little over \$15 million that we're in the process of determining how that's going to be allocated. But again, that's going to go to election security and related election administration.

So, we're looking -- it's -- We're very happy for the extra funding, and we're gonna be working with identifying what the highest priority expenses are, but it's really gonna be going to the counties to make sure that they have the resources they need to carry out all these programs.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you.

And just a quick follow-up. Is your

Department engaged in any PR to kind of inform

voters and people who are going to be participating

in our election system all the changes and the

options they have now as a voter?

2.1

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yes. We actually started last year what -- what we're calling Ready to Vote 2020, and after --

So, originally, it was mostly directed at the new voting systems and making sure that every voter knows what voting system is in place in their county, how to use it and all that. Then Act 77 happened, so we added all of that to this initiative.

So we are about to roll out -- There's going to be 67 individual web pages for each county, so that each voter is going to be able to identify what exact configuration of their voting system is in place, how to use it, all the links.

Then also, we're going to be putting out all kinds of information. We already have like a -- sort of like a palm card that talks about the most significant Act 77 changes. We're gonna be blasting on social media.

We actually created a tool kit which is gonna be part of the rollout with the web pages and the tool kit. People can take, whether it's legislators, whether it's county officials, whether it's advocates, anybody who wants to can take -
It's to sort of help all of us help the voters get

accurate information on what the deadlines are, 1 where to find information, and so forth. 2 3 So, yes, we have a lot of that going on. REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank vou. 4 thank you for your efforts as we lead forward with 5 6 this rather large change in the way we do 7 elections. Thank you, Madam Secretary. ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: 8 Thank you, Representative. 10 Next will be Representative Grove. 11 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Good morning. SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Good morning. 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: How many people 14 do you anticipate that are gonna vote in the general election this year? 15 16 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: I'm going to kick 17 this to you, Jonathan. 18 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: I'm not gonna 19 hold you accountable for it because it's an 20 estimate. But --21 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: I hate to 22 prognosticate, but we can expect that over 23 6 million people will vote in the November election. 2.4 25 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: All right. Six

1 million people voting. 2 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: Ιn 3 Pennsylvania, of course. REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: In Pennsylvania. 4 So, statistically significant is usually around 5 6 5 percent or less. So depending on the model you run, you can actually be discounting votes within 7 that equation. So, if you're expecting 6 million 8 votes, 5 percent aren't voting, if you run a model 10 based on 5 percent, which is usually the 11 statistical significant value, you're basically 12 saying 300,000 votes, if they're not counted are 13 okay. So, I would say your model better be set at 14 zero, right? SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Are you talking 15 16 about the post-election audit? 17 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Correct. 18 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So right now all 19 that's required in Pennsylvania is 2 percent; 2 percent or 2000 votes, whichever is less, in the 20 21 county. 22 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. 23 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, just to be clear, that's the only thing at this point that's 24 25 required that's equivalent to an audit.

1 So, on Election Day, a hundred percent 2 of the votes are going to be counted, period. And then, of course, absentees and overseas, and all 3 that over the following week, you know, they come in. Obviously, the overseas voters have a 5 6 (inaudible word). A hundred percent of the votes 7 are gonna be counted. Under current law, there's this 8 2 percent requirement. What we're exploring are 10 additional -- additional ways to confirm, so 11 mathematical, statistically significant ways. 12 is not taking away from anything that currently 13 exists. 14 And, in addition, I think you know that under Pennsylvania law, if the results of a 15 statewide election are under .5 percent --16 17 Is that correct? 18 -- there's an automatic statewide -- Is 19 that right? 20 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: A half a 21 percent, yes. 22 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yes, half a 23 percent. There's an automatic statewide full recount. So none of that is going away. We're 24 25 actually adding a level to increase, so I just want

1 to make sure that's clear. 2 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: I just want to be very, very clear, and I want you to say that. We 3 will ensure every vote is counted. 4 5 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Hundred percent. REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Okay. 6 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Hundred percent. 7 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: 8 Because you 9 worried me when you said statistically significant 10 because that's usually around 5 percent. So I'm not -- I'm not, like, if we're kind of close at 11 12 5 percent, we're good with this election, right? 13 So we are -- we're making sure every vote --14 And post audit, we're verifying that, 15 correct? 16 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Correct. Deputy 17 Secretary Marks would like to add something as 18 well, if that's okay. 19 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: I just wanna --20 I wanna make sure there's no confusion about what 21 -- what risk-limiting post -- risk-limiting 22 post-election audits do. 23 The 2 percent the Secretary is talking 24 about, which is current law, typically come in 25 batches. So the county will select 2 percent of

```
1
      its precincts, so they'll select 2 percent of the
 2
      ballots.
 3
                 What a -- What a risk-limiting audit
      does, it spreads out. It selects ballots from all
 4
 5
      across the county, so you're getting a sample that
      reflects the entire universe of votes in the county
 6
 7
      as opposed to just one small percentage. That's
      why you can say with a higher degree of certainty
 8
      that that audit confirms the results of election as
10
      opposed to just polling 2 percent of the ballots.
                 Does that -- Does that make sense?
11
12
                 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: It makes perfect
13
      sense, yes.
14
                 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: But, most important
      to your question, a hundred percent of the ballots
15
16
      are counted, and that's --
17
                 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: I want to make
18
      sure that's our bar.
19
                 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: That is.
20
                 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Not significantly
21
22
                 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: I cannot --
23
                 REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: -- statistically
      significant 'cause --
24
25
                 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: I cannot -- I
```

1	cannot express that more strongly. A hundred
2	percent of the votes will be counted.
3	REPRESENTATIVE GROVE: Thank you. Madam
4	Secretary and Deputy Secretary, we appreciate the
5	work you did with the Oversight Committee moving
6	forward. So, thank you.
7	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you,
8	Representative.
9	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank
LO	you, Representative.
L1	Next will be Representative Fiedler.
12	REPRESENTATIVE FIEDLER: Hello, Madam
13	Secretary. Thank you for being here.
L 4	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Good morning.
L5	REPRESENTATIVE FIEDLER: Good morning,
L 6	and it's still morning.
L7	According to an IFO report in November
18	2018, 88 percent of eligible voters are actually
L 9	registered to vote, and only 52 percent of
20	registered voters actually vote. Could you tell us
21	what the Department is doing to increase voter
22	turnout, please?
23	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Sure. And I want
24	to thank the Legislature again for Act 77, even
25	though as the Chairman mentioned, it's a bit of

work.

But, Act 77 really is our, you know, one of our first steps forward in a long time that can make serious quantifiable change in that. So, for example, Act 77 changed the registration deadline. Instead of being 30 days before an election, it's now 15 days before an election. Cutting that period in half can have dramatic effect in and of itself to registration.

Turnout and registration now enabling voters to vote by mail, and by mail being, you know, words that actually can also be done in person, is a tremendous increase in convenience to voters. So, I think this is gonna be incredibly helpful for voter turnout because now voters --

So I can vote absentee because I live in Bucks County, but I know I'm gonna be in Harrisburg all day. Or I can vote by mail because I just feel like voting by mail. And I could decide, you know what, two weeks before Election Day, I just want to go over to the county elections office and I wanna vote now, today, for no reason; for any reason at all.

So the ability to go into an elections office two, three, four weeks before Election Day

and say, here's my application to vote by mail.

They hand you your ballot literally that day, go in the back, fill it out, hand it back in, done.

That's voter convenience that we've never had in Pennsylvania.

And then, on top of that, I think there's gonna be -- I think the Ready to Vote 2020 is going to be, you know, getting information, as needed, to the voters. I think there's, you know, obviously, a lot that you all will be helpful in -- I think it's gonna be hard not to be paying attention. So I think --

Oh, and let me not forget to mention all our online advancements. So, online voter registration had dramatic effects that went back several years ago, and we expect over 60 percent of registrations to come in online. I encourage all of you, as you know folks who are registering people to vote, tell them to use the online registration. It is so much more effective, quick. It cuts down on errors. It makes sure that the system is not, you know, accidentally data entering wrongly.

But now you also have online absentee and vote-by-mail applications. So I encourage

2.1

everybody to use that system. Not only do you, again, data entry errors are much minimized, but you'll get e-mail notifications telling you when your ballot has been rec -- when your ballot has been processed, when it's being sent in the mail.

So, I think all these things together are really gonna have an impact.

REPRESENTATIVE FIEDLER: Thank you for that. When it comes to online absentee ballot applications, compared to previous years, have you seen an increase in the actual applications?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, I think -- Ask me that in a couple of months. We just started the online applications last year, and we just -- we opened it a week ago. Already, just in the first week of opening it this year, we already have over 14,000 applications in one week alone. That's incredible.

REPRESENTATIVE FIEDLER: Can you put that in perspective for us compared to a typical week or --

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Because this is the first time that we have the vote by mail, it's -- I can't really compare it because last year was only absentee. So I think each time we use it -- So

2.1

```
1
      it's not really fair to compare it, but...
 2
                 Do you know what the first week was?
 3
                  DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: A third of them
      are mail-in requests.
 4
                  SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: A third of the
 5
      14,000?
 6
 7
                 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS:
                                          Yes.
                 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So -- But you don't
 8
 9
      know where we were a week in last year when we
10
      opened the absentee application?
                 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: I think we're
11
12
      at a few thousand --
13
                 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR:
14
      Secretary Marks, could you please use the
      microphone so we can hear you? Thank you.
15
16
                 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: I'm sorry.
17
                  I don't recall exactly where we were at
18
      after week one.
19
                  SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So I think it's
20
      higher, but I don't think there's an apples to
21
      apples because we literally just started this
22
      program.
23
                 But, as -- as Deputy Secretary Marks
24
      said, I can tell you that last year when we rolled
25
      out the online absentee application, 30 percent of
```

1 all the applications came in electronically, so 2 that was far greater success than we ever imagined for the first time it was used. I think we're 3 gonna see dramatically higher this year because now it can be anybody who submits it that way. 5 6 But come back. I'm happy to give 7 updates as we go. It's just new, so... REPRESENTATIVE FIEDLER: We'll check in 8 next time. Thank you very much. 10 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you. ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: 11 Thank 12 you, Representative. 13 Next will be Representative Hahn. 14 REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: Thank you, 15 Chairman. 16 Good morning, Madam Secretary. 17 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Good morning. 18 REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: I'm gonna switch 19 gears. I'm going to give you a break from voter reg and I'm going to professional licensure. 20 21 One of the things that we hear in our 22 office, we get so many calls on, are for licenses 23 and the delay in getting them. So, can you tell me what the Department's doing? 24 25 I know we got a letter, especially for,

I think nursing especially, they graduate in May and December, so we know that, and we get calls.

These are students who have jobs waiting for them.

They want to get their license approved as soon as possible. I know I had a family member who had to wait on her start date because it didn't go through.

What are you doing to help that process?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you for asking that question.

So, we have done -- I'm really, really pleased with where we are today compared to where we were a year ago. So, as you know, when we rolled out PALS, the online application licensing system, which was back -- It kind of was on a rolling basis in 2015, 2016, 2017, and then it was -- in early 2018, I believe, was when it started to really go live for the most of the licenses in Pennsylvania.

So, for example, in 2018, the average turnaround for nursing in Pennsylvania was approximately 88 days, which is unacceptable.

REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: But why?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, that was 2018.

So I -- So I -- I was not Secretary at that point.

1	So, as soon as I became Secretary, which was
2	January 5th, 2019, within a couple of weeks, and I
3	brought Acting Commissioner Johnson on early, I
4	think March of 2019, we hired a new director of
5	operations. We restructured the Department, and we
6	started basically putting together a group of
7	cross-sector analysis to look at, literally, every
8	phase of the process, the licensing process in
9	Pennsylvania from the moment the license
10	application comes into the door to the moment it's
11	granted, because we we asked the same question
12	you did. Why? Why is it taking that long?
13	So it turned out that there were a
14	number of different factors, including the
15	processes in Penn that were being used were not
16	effective. Staff were not well-trained. In
17	addition, there was not good information to
18	stakeholders, to applicants.
19	REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: Whose staff was
20	not well-trained? Yours?
21	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: The prior the
22	prior staff. They hadn't gotten
23	REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: Okay.
24	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yes, I'm sorry.
25	The boards, you know, that oversees it. There are

29 boards and commissions in Pennsylvania that oversee all the hundreds of -- of licenses.

So we started hitting every facet of that, from like, literally, the documents processing center which is the first phase of the process to improvements to the technology, to increase -- We hired a director of state -- of Intergovernmental Affairs who's making sure that stakeholders are engaged. I'm happy to tell you that as of late 2018 -- So, again, I said 88 days for nurses in 2018, it's down to below 50 days as of the end of 2019, in one year. So --

REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: But that's still a long time. And when I'm looking at, you know, cosmetology, and I understand there's probably less cosmetology licenses coming in than nursing. But I think --

I know in my staff, we know at certain times of the year rebates are a big thing, so, we're prepared. You know May and December are going to be big months. Do you have people that are going to come in and help that? When you --

We want to keep the jobs here in Pennsylvania. When people have jobs waiting for them and then they can't take them, that's --

that's concerning to me.

2 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yeah.

make sure -- And I have to tell you, the letter that we got that said, don't call our office until after three weeks, the schools are telling their students, the only way you're going to get your license through is if you call a legislator's license. Then we're told don't call us, because now you know everybody is calling us --

And your staff is great. When we call our "Leg." office, they're always very helpful. I have no complaints about that. I just didn't appreciate the letter saying, don't call us for three weeks. I think that's something you need to take up on your end and get those documents in as fast as possible.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, a couple -Thank you for all that. A couple of things.

I think there was some confusion about, um -- about how -- And I apologize for the letter causing any confusion.

What's happened is that, there's, say,

X group of people who are all applying and they get

put in a cue and all need to be processed. And so,

1 when you have -- When there's a problem it makes 2 total sense to put people out of line; make sure that there's not a problem. 3 But when you -- When it's part of the 4 regular process for legislative calls to reorder 5 the applicants, there's also all these other 6 applicants who then get pushed down the line. So I think the intent of the letter, it may not have 8 been well-worded, but to make it so that it's 10 reserve for when there's actually problems, so that 11 the people that are in the cue, it ends up taking 12 more time for everybody if it's not orderly. 13 REPRESENTATIVE HAHN: And I agree. Ι 14 think if you process them in a more timely manner, we won't have that problem on either end. 15 16 I see my time is up. Thank you. 17 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank 18 you, Representative. 19 Next will be Representative Bullock. 20 REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Good morning. 2.1 How are you doing, Madam Secretary? 22 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Good morning. 23 are you? REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Great. 24 25 I have two sets of questions. The first one you're probably familiar with, and that's regards to your own force diversity and inclusion within your Department, if you can share your percentages, and also share them in comparison to last year, and any changes or growth in that area. Specifically, adding to that question, the percentages of women and minorities that are in positions of supervisor or management or executive roles.

My second set of question kind of pivots a little bit off of the last line of questions, but also focuses on diversity and inclusion in regards to those professions and occupations that require licensing. We know that those occupations, whether it be cosmetology, plumbing or others, this is where a lot of folks can support their families, and we want to get Pennsylvanians working.

Sometimes there are obstacles to get those Pennsylvanians licensed and working. Those obstacles may include criminal records, licensing fees and other things. There's some legislation, both in the Senate and I believe also in the House that looks at how we can revise the current sort of statutory language around criminal records and how they're looked at and used to keep people from

2.1

obtaining licenses.

2.1

I'd like for you to opine on what that legislation would mean and how we can diversify some of those professions, and whether there are other changes we can make as a Legislature to make those professions more available and open so all communities, whether it's licensing fees, waivers, or other things.

And lastly, in regards to that, is there anything your Department is doing to keep a record or study the diversity of those professions? Is it optional for applicants to indicate their race or gender, by example, or is there -- Are there any records you're keeping in that regard to sort of track how those professions are diverse?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you. So,

I'll start with the first question first.

So, we are -- we have -- we are very proud of the -- We have a much higher rate of women, both white women and women of color, than the Commonwealth as a whole. So our non-minority female rate is 45 percent for 2019 compared to 32 percent for the Commonwealth as a whole, and 12 percent for women of color compared to 9 percent for the Commonwealth as a whole.

I have to say, I'm particularly proud of our leadership team which are -- have a tremendous number of women.

Our men of color are 5 percent compared to 6 percent as a whole, so we can certainly do better there. But, we -- We actually, just in the last couple of weeks and in the next couple of weeks are adding to our leadership team another woman of color and another veteran, which we don't have -- I want to also make sure that we're increasing our veteran representation in the state and throughout the Commonwealth.

So, I think we're -- I feel like we have a great diversity among our leadership team and overall. But, I think we always have more we can do, so...

Did that answer -- Was there another question?

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK:} \mbox{ That answered}$ the first part. Thank you.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Great.

So the second part had a number of different levels to it. So, I think I'm going to answer some of them. Then I'm gonna ask Acting Commissioner Johnson to answer some of them as

2.1

1	well.
2	So the CHRIA bill, I'm not sure if
3	you're familiar with, but that's Is it called
4	that in both the House and Senate?
5	ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: It is.
6	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: What does CHRIA
7	stand for?
8	ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: It's the
9	Criminal History Records Information Act.
LO	REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Yes, I'm
11	familiar with that particular bill.
L2	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So we very strongly
L3	support the Senate version of the bill.
L 4	Do you want to talk about Do you know
L5	the difference between the Senate and the House
L 6	version?
L7	ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Sure.
L8	The bureau's position on the Senate bill
L 9	is that they support we support the Senate
20	version of the bill. The House version of the bill
21	we feel there are some factors that are a little
22	more restrictive than
23	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR:
24	Commissioner, can you get a little closer to the
25	microphone? Thank you.

ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Sorry. Is that better, Representative?

We're concerned about some of the factors in the House version of the bill that seemed to be a little more restrictive in terms of the presumption that's placed on the candidate for licensure, and also the shifting of the burden from, essentially, the board to the applicant to prove that they are not a harm to the public.

We welcome the opportunity to work with the Legislature to -- to bring clarity or to provide a perspective to the drafting of the legislation. As we have worked in the past with the Legislature, we'll continue to work with you on those types of initiatives.

But, we certainly support opportunities where we can -- where we can talk about our policies, I think, in the past few years, you've seen it. We have implemented a change in the policy in the way that we -- that we have -- that we have implemented our -- our interpretation of the CHRIA legislation so that we are making sure that we provide opportunities to everyone.

We are -- We are currently in the process of working to promote a lot of these

initiatives, not just in-house, but also to the public. We'll be working with the Department of Corrections this year. They typically run job fairs throughout -- throughout the year at their different institutions. We want to have a presence there this year. We want to promote licensing opportunities and availability to those individuals that have -- that have -- you know, they've done their time.

They have committed to rehabilitation, and they've undergone training while incarcerated. We want to be able make sure that they have the information they need when they return back to society, and they're ready to take that next step and become taxpaying citizens.

Does that answer the second part of your question?

REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Most of it.

There was this whether or not you're keeping any records of diversity in those individual professions and licensing.

ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: So, we do not capture that type of demographic data amongst our regulated community. In the past we have -- we have initiated optional surveys for our board

1 members to capture those statistics. But, we have found in the past that applicants for licensure and 2 3 also active licensees are not as receptive to answering those types of questions. 4 If we could find a -- If we could find a 5 6 platform or we could find a vehicle that would --7 would promote that level of -- of information sharing, it may not come from us directly. But if 8 we certainly could facilitate that, we'd be open. 10 If the Legislature has any suggestions or ideas, we'd be -- we'd be willing to. 11 12 REPRESENTATIVE BULLOCK: Thank you. 13 I'll definitely follow that directive up with your 14 Department. 15 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 16 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank 17 you. 18 Next will be Representative Culver. 19 REPRESENTATIVE SCHLEGEL-CULVER: 20 you. Madam Secretary, over here. 21 22 The Governor has been advocating across 23 the state in his budget for funding for mental health services. I, along with 108 other House 24 25 members on both sides of the aisle, are cosponsors

of House Bill 1900 which creates a professional licensure for behavior analyst.

These professionals use the science of applied behavior called Applied Behavior Analysis, or ABA, to improve the outcomes for individuals with chronic conditions. Currently, 31 states licensed behavioral specialists, or analysts, and New Jersey just licensed them last month.

So with that said, can you explain to the Committee why these professionals were denied their Sunrise application for proposed licensure of behavioral analyst when this Administration is looking for more funding and qualified and experienced providers to reduce health care cost?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So I'm gonna defer

ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Good morning, Representative.

this again to Acting Commissioner Johnson.

So, to answer your question, we did review the Sunrise application. We did not support licensure at this time. We are open to discussions with the stakeholders to discuss our reasons for why we did not support the Sunrise application.

To parse some of the detail, we did not -- We were concerned about the application creating

the presumption of an elite class of licensure that was separate from the existing class of licensure that already exists, which was the behavioral specialist licensing class, of which behavior analysts can now operate under. We expressed that concern to the stakeholders.

We also expressed a concern to work with them moving forward to try to amend the language or work within -- work within our existing parameters to come back with a -- with a vehicle that makes sense to us and also makes sense to them and, hopefully, push forward in the process.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHLEGEL-CULVER: So I think the concern is, in my district specifically, parents are getting great results with behavioral analysts and specialists that they were not seeing before, and being able to intergrate children specifically into situations that may have been impossible previously. So, they are seeking out these services.

I think it's incumbent upon us to make sure that they are getting to the professionals, somebody who's been well-trained, and that licensure I think kind of -- gives that assurance to the public that that's what they're getting what

2.1

they're seeking, and the child is getting the best care possible, or the individual is getting the best care possible.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Am I correct,
behavioral specialists are licensed in
Pennsylvania, so this is creating an additional -Is that correct?

ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: That's correct.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So we have behavioral specialists. It was just creating a separate behavioral analyst.

I think one of the goals is -- You know, this is a constant balance, I think, and the Governor is always trying to reach this where, sometimes creating a new class can actually create barriers rather than lower barriers. So, it doesn't make sense to create a new class of licensees or work through the existing behavioral specialists.

I don't pretend to know all the issues involved here. I'm happy to continue having these conversations, but I think -- It's a high priority for the Governor not to create barriers for people who are looking to assist with the populations that

2.1

1 you're talking about. 2 REPRESENTATIVE SCHLEGEL-CULVER: I think 3 we would agree with that. If you would be open to more dialogue on the issue, we would be glad to 4 come and talk to you about it. 5 6 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: That sounds good. 7 Thank you, Representative. REPRESENTATIVE SCHLEGEL-CULVER: 8 Thank 9 you. 10 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank 11 you, Representative. 12 Next will be Representative Sanchez. 13 REPRESENTATIVE SANCHEZ: Thank you, Mr. 14 Chairman. 15 Thank you, Madam Secretary. Way up 16 here. 17 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: My eyesight is not 18 what it used to be. 19 REPRESENTATIVE SANCHEZ: It always 20 throws people off when you're right in the line of 21 sight, too. Just one very granular question in 22 your past experience as an election lawyer you would probably know the answer off the top of your 23 24 head. But, with Act 77 may have changed us a 25 little bit. When challenging at the canvass of

1 ballots, does Act 77 allow county officials to post 2 a list of all the names of those who cast ballots in lieu of having to read each name out loud? 3 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, actually, we 4 just had this conversation, didn't we? And what 5 was the conclusion we reached? 6 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: We're actually 7 still reviewing it with the Department's counsel. 8 It says -- The statute actually uses the 10 term --SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: 11 Announce. 12 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: -- announce. 13 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Right. 14 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: Depending on 15 how rigid you are in your interpretation, announce 16 could mean verbally announcing. 17 Certainly providing a list in advance of 18 that hearing is helpful. Our hope would be that 19 the parties, if they wish to make challenges, would 20 know going into the canvass which ballots they 21 wanted to challenge and for what reason. 22 The difficulty is trying to -- trying 23 not to have too loose of an interpretation of the term announce, and maybe that's something the 24 25 General Assembly could look at. I think a list

certainly serves the purpose and meets the spirit of the law. It's getting around that specific word announce.

REPRESENTATIVE SANCHEZ: I think, to your point, it certainly hinges on that very word and could save a lot of time with the clarity and from secondary challenge.

So, thank you very much.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you.

ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank you, Representative.

Next will be Representative Gabler.

REPRESENTATIVE GABLER: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, it's great to have a chance to talk to you here. I've appreciated working with you both as a member of the House State Government Committee and as a member here on this Committee.

I did want to correct the record on something that was stated by the Minority Chairman a little bit earlier. I have expressed my concerns in the past that the Administration, through some of the Governor's decisions, has created the artificial timeline and the challenge that,

frankly, your Department has had to respond to.

The Governor made the unilateral decision in 2018 to decertify the election systems. I think in spite of the fact that all of us can agree the goal is laudable. I think the artificial timeline that was placed on everybody, the General Assembly, the Department of State, was something that has created some chaos and some confusion.

The Minority Chairman had stated that the General Assembly has thrown some curve balls to the Department. I would say that the General Assembly has actually been a very willing partner in providing legislation and solutions.

There was a Governor's veto in early
2019 that then led us to be scrambling in the fall,
but then we delivered two pieces of legislation,
Act 77 and Act 94, that have updated the statute in
collaboration and cooperation between the General
Assembly and the Department of State.

So, from the standpoint of timeline, I just wanted to start by asking, where do you feel the Department is based on our posture for implementing everything that needs to happen so that we have a successful 2020 season of elections, both primary and general?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Are you asking about everything; the voting systems' upgrade and Act 77, and kind of all things that go into elections?

REPRESENTATIVE GABLER: Right. Just as far as, where we sit right here in February, do you believe that the Department is where it needs to be so we can avoid any kind of chaos both for May and November this year, so that, whatever the outcome of the election is, everyone can agree that there's confidence that those results are what they should be?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Absolutely, a hundred percent.

First of all, with regard to the voting systems upgrade, I'm happy to say that a hundred percent of the counties as of December 30th, voted to select new voting systems. 45 of the counties had already rolled them out in 2019, so there's 22 counties that are rolling them out for the first time in either April or in one of the special elections before April.

They have been -- They have been very closely in touch with us. We were much more -- As a result of some of the lessons that we learned

from November about not having enough scanners in some of the counties and so forth, I think the counties that were remaining, you know, nobody wants to be the focus, right? Let's just be honest. So that's been --

And Act 77 has been -- the \$90 million, of course, has also been helpful. And us saying to the counties, oh, like, order every piece of equipment you need; every piece of equipment.

Don't hold back. You'll be getting most of your reimbursement for this. The payoff is, obviously, far outweighs any cost. So the counties have been doing that, and they've been purchasing. They've been talking to us.

Jonathan and our team have been talking to vendors. I had spoken in November at a hearing before the Senate, talking about all the things we were going to do. That's all been happening.

We've been talking to counties. We've been talking to vendors. Whether it's printers or voting system manufacturers, or the -- all the different component pieces that go into it, those conversations have been being had.

The counties are very -- are training their poll workers, their election officials,

2.1

making sure that they understand how to program so that some of the human errors that happened in a couple of counties in November don't happen again.

So the transition to the new voting systems is going great. The delivery, you know, places where they are still getting delivered, all's been on track and I have very, very high confidence.

Act 77, on, you know, the other side -not the other side, but just an additional thing,
also high confidence in where we are. So, right
after Act 77 was passed, we created a work group,
kind of command center with the counties. So we
had a conversation with CCAP within a day of Act 77
passing, maybe it was same day, and there was -there was a recommendation that we create this very
active work group. So that involves election
directors, county commissioners and CCAP from at
least 11 counties, all different shapes and sizes
across the Commonwealth.

Department of State and other folks who are -- CCAP, CIO and other folks to make sure that each piece of that puzzle, whether it's revising forms and envelopes to online information, to training, all that is being carried out. So I want

to say, the counties are doing phenomenal. It's been a terrific partnership, and I have very high confidence in everything.

REPRESENTATIVE GABLER: Thank you. If I could follow up, because I did have one follow-up I wanted to ask pertaining to the decertification of an existing election system that has an audible voter verifiable paper trail. Why was -- And the example given previously and the questions with Chester County?

Why was it necessary to decertify a system like that that already had a voter verifiable paper trail and an audible after-the-fact paper ballot? It seems that that would have met all the criteria for a secure, safe confident system, and it seemed like that might have been a decision to throw out the baby with the bath water.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: And that was the hardest question that really was part of this endeavor, this initiative, because, they had a paper trail, as you said.

The downside is, what they had, their systems were still 15 years old. And so, when you think about it in terms of the technology of the scanners -- the copy machines and scanners that we

used 15 years ago were not as nearly as good as the scanners that we have now, the copiers we have now. Neither the quality of --

When you think about, like, hand-marked paper ballots, sometimes people don't fully fill in circles, or maybe there's a -- you've got oil on your fingers and it smudges. The old systems are much more likely to pick up those kind of inaccuracies than the new ones.

In addition, the new ones, they have much higher security standards. Because, as I started out earlier saying, we created these very stringent security standards for every piece of equipment being used in the Commonwealth. So every one of our new systems has gone through penetration testing by experts. It's gone through access control testing to make sure that every potential access point is secure.

So, all the old systems were created even before the Federal EAC, Election Assistance Commission, even existed. So, they had none of those protections. So, basically, that's why they were included; to make sure that they were offering voters the same protections and the same advances that every other voter in the Commonwealth would

2.1

Τ	have.
2	And, in addition, the ADA accessible
3	machines, even Chester County and any paper trail,
4	or already-existing paper trail county had to have,
5	again, that those needed to be up to par as well.
6	Does that answer your question?
7	REPRESENTATIVE GABLER: It does. I know
8	I'm out of time. I'll just wrap up by saying, I
9	would express some concern. If we're If we're
10	in a position where we have to replace our election
11	systems every 15 years, we use them two days a
12	year, so that every 30 days we're throwing out our
13	computer and replacing it. I have a concern with
14	that. So I hope going forward we've got systems
15	that has staying power. Thank you:
16	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you.
17	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank
18	you, Representative.
19	Next will be Representative Gainey.
20	Happy birthday, Ed.
21	REPRESENTATIVE GAINEY: Good morning,
22	Madam Secretary. How are you?
23	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Good morning,
24	Representative. How are you?
25	REPRESENTATIVE GAINEY: First I want to

thank you for all the work that you put in to make sure our elections are safe. I know a lot of people want to dig into the details, but the reality is something had to be done. You stepped up to the plate and you did it. There's no perfect system, but there's always perfective ways. First and foremost, I want to thank you for that.

Secondly, I want to talk about our senior population. I know a lot of it will fall on the county, but you also know that the majority of our seniors are not on social media. A lot of them are going to be impacted in many ways about the new changes in this whole voting process.

My question is -- My first question is, is there going to be a direct -- a direct campaign to talk to seniors whether that's public service announcements or something from the state level to let them know of the changes or who they can contact? Because you and I know that after five minutes of being frustrated, that's a wrap.

So what I'm trying -- I'm trying to ask is, how will education happen? Will it be public service announcement? What will we do and how can we help you to help us to better communicate the changes to our senior population?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: That's a great question. And may I just say, thank you for your remarks at the Black History Month event. It was really powerful. So thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE GAINEY: Thank you.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, as I mentioned earlier, this Ready to Vote 2020 is a good vehicle or a hub to make sure information is being given out to everyone of every -- you know, young, old, in-between. But I think, you know --

The good news about Act 77 combined with the new voting systems is that, we have so many more choices that they can use. So I think one of the things that we'd love your help with is making sure -- I mean, you all, you know, you talk to your constituents in a different way than we can do at the state level. And so, if you can be bringing --

Like, if we -- we're going to have, like I said, this--what are we calling it?--the tool kit, which gives ideas for specific language, and we have PDFs that you can take our talking points and put it on your card. And if you go into, you know, a senior citizens center, you can bring the information with you. We have --

We're working with other agencies as

well. For example, Department of Aging is a really good, you know, partner to make sure that they're getting information out to the Triple A's. I think there are other agencies as well as they touch people in the communities more than, say, the Department of State directly does.

But we're also going to, you know, different community events to make sure that we're touching this population.

So what I would say is, if you have suggestions, if you know that in your county you have, whatever. In the summer you have an event where it has the opportunity to touch a lot of people, in addition to PSAs and the other ways of touching people, radio, so forth. If there are events that you know of, please let us know. We can get you materials. We can send somebody there. Happy to talk. We have already been talking to organizations that reach out and want just more information. So, we'd love to work together with you on this.

REPRESENTATIVE GAINEY: I appreciate that.

My second question is, we talked about the House bill and the Senate bill when it comes to

people coming home and being able to -- being able to get licensures. Can you go a little bit more into detail about the difference between the House and the Senate bill and while one is more acceptable than the other? I just think people should hear it.

ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: So, Rep, I apologize. From memory I can't quote all the different factors that -- all the different distinctions, but I'd love to follow up on that question with you.

REPRESENTATIVE GAINEY: Any time we can follow up I think that's great. I just think if we're going to create centers of hope, people have to understand the difference and why one is more effective than the other.

I appreciate you all being here, and thank you.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you.

ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank you. Commissioner Johnson, can you pick up the microphone and just pull it back to you a little bit because people are having trouble hearing. Thank you so much.

Next will be Representative White.

1 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Thank you, 2 Secretary -- or Chairman. Secretary, I have a couple of questions, 3 one of which is regarding the mail-in ballots. 4 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yes. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Can you just talk to us a little bit about the difference between 7 ballot harvesting versus ballot collecting, and 8 what's permissible in Pennsylvania versus not 10 permissible in Pennsylvania? SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: I have to admit. 11 Ι 12 don't know what ballot harvesting is. So, 13 Jonathan, do you? 14 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: If you're referring to -- Whether you call it harvesting or 15 16 collecting, if you're talking about third-party 17 delivery of the ballots themselves, it's not 18 authorized by Pennsylvania law, with one exception; 19 for voters with disabilities. 20 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Okay. So can I 21 give you an example of some things I have heard 22 rumored to be taking place in Philadelphia, and you 23 can tell me whether or not it's permissible? DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: I --24 25 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: One of which --

1 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: I can try. 2 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Well, I mean, 3 either it is or it isn't, right? Quick question. If someone was to take 4 a mail-in ballot application into a center, let's 5 6 just say this office space is created and people walk in. They receive an application to apply for early voting, which is not a big deal, right? 8 Anybody can take in an application. 10 But then the individual completing the 11 application hands the application back to the --12 over the counter and says, okay, I'm good. I'm all done. I'm going to apply. Okay. That application 13 14 is taken by the individual across the counter, 15 submitted on their behalf, good to go. 16 But, the return mailing address is 17 located at that center, because the person 18 requested that the mail-in ballot be sent to the 19 mail-in center, right? 20 Then the person behind the counter that 2.1 took everything in, they start calling up when the 22 ballot comes in the mail. They call up the individual and say, hey, your main-in ballot is 23 here. Come on down and complete it and submit it. 24

So, that all takes place, right?

1 So, the mail-in ballot is now in hand at 2 the center, right, and holding it. Person comes up to the counter, here's your -- here's your mail-in 3 ballot. Go over to the table, fill it out, and hand it back to me and we'll get it to where it 5 6 needs to go. 7 Is that all permissible? DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: I had a little 8 trouble following all of the factual pattern there. 10 But, if the voter has a disability -- and there's a 11 form for this. If the voter is voting because they 12 have a disability or an illness that prevents them 13 from appearing in person, they can authorize an 14 individual to -- to take delivery of the ballot and deliver it to them. So, as long as that process is 15 16 followed, that doesn't violate --17 And I'm not the Department's counsel, so 18 you're getting a non-attorney's --19 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Understood. 20 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: -- opinion 2.1 here. But that doesn't violate the election code. 22 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Is that just for 23 absentee ballots, or is that for mail-in ballots as 24 well?

25

DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: It would be for

both, absentees and mail-in ballots as I understand it. What changed in Act 77, previously for voters with disabilities, you could only have -- it was a one for one. A person could authorize an individual to deliver their ballot for them. And that authorized representative could only deliver one person's ballot.

Act 77 changed that. Now an authorized representative can deliver multiple ballots for multiple people provided they've been authorized by those individuals.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: And what is the authorized criteria? Just verbal?

affirmation that the voter has to fill out basically saying, I authorize this person. If it's me, I authorize Jonathan Marks to deliver my ballot for me. It's a signed affirmation. And I believe the -- Again, I'm not Department's counsel, but I believe the penalties for falsely swearing on an affirmation are the same as falsely swearing an affidavit.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: And I'm just gonna
-- I don't often disagree with Jonathan, but I
might disagree on this one point, which is, I think

2.1

```
1
      it may be only for absentee because, technically,
      if you're a qualified absentee, you're not
 2
      qualified for mail-in at this point.
 3
                 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: Correct.
 4
                 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: It's a little
 5
 6
      vague, but I think --
                 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: It won't be vague
 7
      on Election Day, I'll tell ya.
 8
                 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yeah.
10
                 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: That's why I'm
11
      trying to get clarification today.
12
                 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, for the
13
      designation of an agent, it has to be -- it's only
14
      like Jonathan said, it has to be people that have
15
      disabilities or illnesses that have designated an
16
      agency. Nobody else can -- is authorized to
17
      deliver a ballot on behalf of a mail-in voter who's
18
      voting by mail because they choose to.
19
                 Does that make sense?
20
                 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: That makes sense.
2.1
      I appreciate the clarification. Sorry I couldn't
22
      quite give you the run-down that I would have liked
23
      to, but we got it together in the end. Thank you.
                 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR:
24
                                       Thanks.
25
                 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR:
                                                    Thank
```

you, Representative.

Next will be Representative Cephas.

REPRESENTATIVE CEPHAS: Thank you,

4 Chairman.

Thank you, Secretary, for your willingness. You have a tall order. In 2020, your willingness to navigate this challenging environment domestically and across foreign seas, with hypotheticals, and everything, any of the above. Anything we can do in Philadelphia, please let us know.

But I wanted to switch gears back to professional licensure. Over the past several years, there's been conversations around changing the licensing process as a result of the criminal justice reform conversation. We continue to reference Senate Bill 637, your support.

But an additional area is the issue around maternal mortality, where you have other states that have implemented requirements for professional licenses to incorporate implicit bias training, cultural competency training. So I just wanted to get a sense from your Department, statute versus policy shift.

When do you begin having conversation

and making changes in your licensing process as a result of the national conversation that's happening around different issues related to policy? It's nice to get things by statute, but as you know, it takes time.

So, can you talk with me about -- can

you talk to the point of making internal policy shifts as a result of national conversations that are happening, like, criminal justice reform, the opioid crisis, maternal mortality, and things like that?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: And thank you for asking this excellent question. It's an issue that's particularly close to my heart having come from women's health care before this.

So, the Department of Health, as you know, Secretary Levine has the Maternal Mortality Commission, and I know Philadelphia also has a Maternal Mortality --

REPRESENTATIVE CEPHAS: Review Committee.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Review Committee, yeah. And so, I think -- You know, I'm always interested in that intersection of where policy into law and everywhere in between. So I'm gonna

2.1

ask Commissioner Johnson to respond in more detail. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE CEPHAS: Great. ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you, 3 4 Secretary. Representative, I would say, first to 5 6 answer your question with regards specifically to 7 the implicit bias training and maternal mortality. So, as a member who sits on 27 of the 29 8 boards, I have one vote out of -- out of 10 potentially a dozen. My job as a member of the 11 board is to articulate the policy of the Administration; discuss it with -- discuss it with 12 13 my fellow board members, and to impress upon them, 14 one, that is a priority of the Administration, but 15 also strategize and figure out how to work within 16 the parameters of my -- of my position. 17 I have to separate the administrative 18 obligations and the administrative authority that I 19 have with my persuasive authority in those 20 particular meetings. 21 I can tell you with respect to the 22 implicit bias training, the health licensing boards 23 have been largely supportive of the measure. 24 REPRESENTATIVE CEPHAS: Okay. 25 ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: They have

1 -- They have expressed some opinions about the 2 process. They have expressed -- You know, they have expressed concerns about how --3 REPRESENTATIVE CEPHAS: How to actualize 4 that. 5 ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: 6 7 actualize that; how the training would be -- how their requirement would be recognized. 8 REPRESENTATIVE CEPHAS: 10 ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: 11 think those are all -- I mean, that's all the 12 discussion that they're moving -- that they're 13 blocks. 14 One of the things that we constantly 15 have to balance is our -- our responsibility to 16 both supervise and -- and oversee each of the 29 17 boards or commissions under our authority, but also 18 recognize that they do act autonomously. 19 REPRESENTATIVE CEPHAS: Great. 20 ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: They do 21 have various opinions, various insight as regulated 22 professionals that is valuable to the 23 Administration. I try to work to make sure that that communication is two ways. And I try to -- I 2.4

try to work with our Office of Legislative Affairs

and our Office of Policy to make sure that their 1 messages are communicated up, as well as our 2 messages are communicated down. 3 Without going in -- too much into 4 5 strategy, you know, board members are acutely aware 6 that legislation dictates the parameters of their authority. And they understand that when there's a legislative initiative, they have two options. One 8 is to get on board, and the other is to get out of 10 the way, essentially. 11 So, I think, you know, we use that -- we 12 use that legislative stick, so to speak, to operate 13 in a manner that works within the General 14 Assembly's parameters and works within the 15 Administration's parameters. 16 REPRESENTATIVE CEPHAS: Fantastic. So I 17 stop there because I see the light. Maybe I'll get 18 another question in on the second round. 19 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: 20 you. 2.1 Next will be Representative Owlett. 22 REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: Over on this 23 side. How are you? 24 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Good. How are you? 25 REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT:

1 I have a question on the federal grant 2 for election security. You said it was \$14 million that we received. When did we receive that money? 3 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So there were two. 4 5 2018, we had to submit our program narrative in May or June of 2018, and the money came in probably 6 a couple months after that. And then the counties, as they've been purchasing voting systems, have 8 been submitting their applications; you know, the 10 forms and the purchase orders and so forth. 11 So I think we're at, I don't know 12 (pause) the figures. I think for that grant there 13 is about -- forty-three --14 So, almost 50 counties are in some part of the process. The remaining 17 probably are the 15 16 ones that more recently bought their machines so 17 they haven't submitted their paperwork to us. 18 And then the 2020, that just happened at 19 the very end of December. President Trump signed into law the more recent appropriation, and that's 20 21 the one that's gonna have a little over 22 \$15 million. We actually -- This one worked a 23 little differently, so the money actually already came in --24

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT:

25

Okav.

1 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: -- because we 2 submitted our initial, you know, request basically, but our program narrative is not due until April so 3 we're still working through the details of that; 4 how that will get allocated, but it all needs to be 5 use pursuant to the law for election security or 6 7 election administration, sort of related to that. REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: So they would --8 they would apply for and show receipts from what 10 they've purchased, or is it a grant process for 11 them? I'm just curious. 12 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yes. 13 REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: I'd love to know 14 -- And we could provide a breakdown of all the counties, like, how much went to each county so 15 16 far. 17 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yeah. Would you be 18 REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: 19 able to provide that to us? 20 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yeah, absolutely. 21 2018 was -- we did black and white. A 22 hundred percent was going for the voting systems 23 upgrade, and we divided it -- because it was only going to cover, whatever, 10 to 15 percent or 10 to 24

18 percent. We just decided that the easiest

1 thing, since it was so early on was to just divide 2 it by voter registration percentage. What county are you from? 3 REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: 4 Tioga. 5 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Tioga County. I love the Grand Canyon. 6 So, if Tioga had, whatever, 3 percent of the population of Pennsylvania, then they receive 8 3 percent of the -- I can even look at my list 10 right now and tell you if Tioga has received it. 11 Do you have the list open? 12 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: T do. 13 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: They did. Tioga --14 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: \$45,000. 15 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: \$45,000 they got 16 from that. So for the -- for the Act 77, 17 \$90 million we wanted to -- You know, there were 18 all kinds of different ways we could distribute the 19 money, and we decided the best way to do it would 20 be -- And, again, this was in conversations with 21 the Legislature. So the \$90 million is being 22 distributed based on actual cost, or percentage of 23 actual cost, and that's 60 percent approximately of 24 their expenses. 25 Then the 2020 money we haven't figured

out how it's gonna work yet, but it's probably -it's not gonna all go to the same thing like it did
before. So, I think we're going to use some of it
for certain types of election security equipment
that will go -- that we'll get and go -- and we'll
put in all the counties at no cost to them.

There will be, you know, probably support for these post-election audits that we talked about. Again, this is an add so that the counties can do it at no cost to them. You know, other ballot security transfer costs that they may have due to the new systems; again, that we can just give them at no cost to them. So I think it's going to be used for a number of different things.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: And when will we see that 90 million being pushed out? I know it's out -- Is it out for bond now?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yes. So the -REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: So when can we
-- When can our counties expect to see that?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So the -- We have been -- The counties have been -- are -- have been in the process of getting us their paperwork. So that's been a little bit slower than I would have liked, is getting the paperwork from the counties.

But, now we're almost there. I think there's only maybe six or so counties left who haven't sent us the paperwork, and we need the paperwork in order for PEDFA to move forward the bond. So, we're close to that happening. Then once the bond gets issued, then that money will go out to the counties. But it does --

The first step was getting the counties to actually send us their documents, and that's been a little bit more of a struggle than I would have liked.

Was there something you wanted to add?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: So we have 64

in process. We're following up with a few. So

there are three counties we haven't heard from yet.

REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: My final question is on the GGO. The increase that you have in the proposal is 9.7 percent. Is that -- I'm sorry, 9.76 percent. Is that for new employees, or is this benefits and salaries, additional benefits and salaries? What -- Can you highlight what that 9 percent is for?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Sure. I'm going to kick that to you, Kim Mattis, who is the Director of Finance.

1	DIRECTOR MATTIS: Hi. Yes. Most of it
2	is for the actual employees that do work for the
3	Department. There is an increase of one position
4	for the election modernization initiative, but
5	that's the only position increase for the
6	Department.
7	REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: Okay. So
8	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR:
9	Representative.
10	REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: I can follow up
11	later.
12	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: I
13	don't think we'll have a second round, but maybe
14	somebody else wants to finish your questions for
15	you. Thank you.
16	REPRESENTATIVE OWLETT: That would be
17	great.
18	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: No
19	offense, but I know you spent three and a half
20	hours on a witness stand earlier. I don't want to
21	repeat that today.
22	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you.
23	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: With
24	that being said, we'll move on to Representative
25	Comitta.

1	REPRESENTATIVE COMITTA: Thank you,
2	Mr. Chairman.
3	Good morning. Welcome, Madam Secretary,
4	and team.
5	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you.
6	REPRESENTATIVE COMITTA: So Exciting
7	talking about election reforms in 2020, as we are
8	celebrating the centennial of women's right to
9	vote.
LO	The world is changing rapidly. And can
L1	you remind us how many years had it been since
L2	there had been any election reform legislation
L3	before we just passed Act 77?
L 4	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Since Any
L5	significant reform?
L 6	REPRESENTATIVE COMITTA: Yes.
L7	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Over 80 years.
18	REPRESENTATIVE COMITTA: Can you say
L 9	that again? Eight zero?
20	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Eight decades.
21	REPRESENTATIVE COMITTA: Probably the
22	women that got the right to vote provoked that;
23	moved that forward 80 years ago.
24	But, at any rate, so, as I said, the
25	world is changing rapidly. I think that we can all

agree it isn't going to be 80 years before we have more significant election reform.

So a couple of questions in terms of investing for the future in elections to make sure -- well, we know every vote is gonna be counted, but we want everyone to vote and we want every vote counted.

So, do you think that the Department should have a restrictive fund to assist counties when it's time to update voting machines and systems the next time?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So that's a good question. You know, we were -- we talked about that over the last two years, or year and a half, as we have been having this conversation about the upgrade this time, because I think the other Representative who mentioned the concern about -- I think it was Representative Gabler, about -- the concern about not wanting to do this or sort of starting from scratch having to do this.

We all know technology. I hate that iPhones, they want you to replace them every, what, three years? I'm pushing it at like five right now. But it's very frustrating.

So I do think that it would be a

responsible way of doing this would be -- One of 1 2 the things we talked about is, is there a way to have some small dollar amount added to some fee 3 that then could go into an account? That's just 4 the account for whether it's voting systems, 5 6 whether it's some other need; that you're not 7 starting from zero. I think that would be a great, great investment. 8 REPRESENTATIVE COMITTA: Okay. You can 10 let us know how we can help with that --SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Okav. 11 12 REPRESENTATIVE COMITTA: -- in the 13 Legislature. 14 Would the Department support an election 15 modernization advisory committee that provides 16 input, suggestions, and feedback on the election 17 infrastructure to help plan for the future; get 18 ahead of everything? 19 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Are you talking 20 about legislative or --21 REPRESENTATIVE COMITTA: Well, perhaps. 22 Or, perhaps, you would create such an advisory 23 committee. 2.4 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: I'm happy to say 25 that we already do have those. So we have several

group, which has counties -- county-election officials, CCAP, and then organizations like League of Women Voters and Common Cause, and, you know, any number of different organizations that care about elections and specific engagement meet quarterly, so they on all aspects of election reform administration, and so forth.

We also have assure -- So SURE is our voter registration system in Pennsylvania. We have what's called Assured Advisory Work Group.

DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: Advisory board.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Advisory board, that's now grown into an Act 77 slash SURE advisory board. That's where I was referring earlier to, it has 11 different counties and CCAP and us on it. So that's kind of like a different place for stakeholders and a different group of stakeholders to weigh in.

So, I think we're happy -- be happy to have ongoing, of course, conversations with you

2.1

1 all. 2 We were speaking earlier -- One of the 3 Representatives who I have never met before were speaking about how -- You know, we -- Secretaries 4 have the opportunity to meet with the Senators as 5 6 we're going through the confirmation process. there's a lot of you in the room that I've never met with. I think I would love to have the 8 opportunity to sit down, whether it's about 10 election reform or ideas or, you know. 11 Obviously, we meet with our Chairs. 12 are you looking at me like that, Chairman? 13 thinks I'm crazy. 14 But, seriously, I think I would love any 15 opportunity to meet with any groups of legislators 16 and any other stakeholders on any of the issues we 17 are (inaudible word; sneeze interruption). 18 REPRESENTATIVE COMITTA: That's great. 19 Thank you. So what --20 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: 2.1 Representative, I apologize. 22 REPRESENTATIVE COMITTA: That's quite 23 all right. Thank you very, Mr. Chairman --24 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR:

you.

1 REPRESENTATIVE COMITTA: -- and Madam 2 Secretary. 3 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: will be Representative Topper. 4 REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: 5 Good morning. 6 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Good morning. 7 REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Still morning here. Madam Secretary, thank you so much, each one 8 of you. 10 I just wanna follow up just a little bit 11 I think of where maybe Representative Owlett was 12 going with the GGO line item with the request of 13 \$1.6 million. And we have in our -- in our 14 breakdown of the Governor -- Governor's budget the 15 \$795,000 for elections modernization implementation 16 which we've talked about a little bit as we've gone 17 on today. 18 I quess my -- my thought is talking

about the other \$775,000, which I think is listed as simply continued, whether it be maintenance or just continuing where we are now. That number seems awfully high to me. It's almost a 50/50 split and what is being used for a one-time modernization project versus what we're going to continue to see going forward. My concern would be

19

20

21

22

23

24

that that number would continue to elevate.

2.1

So, could we just hear a little bit about the other 775, why that number, and what it's going to be used for? Thank you.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: I'm gonna ask Director Mattis to reply.

DIRECTOR MATTIS: What we did in our budget request going to this, as we move forward, one of the things that our general government operations appropriation does also have is our elections entity, so that's our Bureau of Elections and Notaries, our Bureau of Elections Security and Technology, and our Bureau of Campaign Financing and Civic Engagement.

So, one of the things is when we have to maintain ongoing operations for those particular bureaus, it is the 100 percent effect on the General Fund. So one of the things we're trying to do is more adequately fund those particular programs in line with what the actual spends are.

So, a lot of the things that we're seeing, we're relying on use of prior waiver dollars, things like that, that might not always be available to us. So --

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: So our spends

have been that low that it requires that kind of an increase to just catch up? Is that -- Is that what you're saying?

DIRECTOR MATTIS: Right. We've had a lot of use of waiver dollars in the past few years, so we're just trying to catch that up to try and get it into a more stable appropriation. One of the things we want is transparency. So having that particular set of expenses in our general government operations line may not be as transparent as we would like it to be.

So we are looking, definitely looking at ways that we can kind of maybe break that apart into a donor appropriation so we can clearly see election funding and what those costs really are and not necessarily as a general government operation appropriation.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: All right. So I'm gonna try and understand, then, where we're going to be, because, you know, as we look at these budgets, we do it year by year, but you also try and project somewhat into the future.

So, I guess what I'm hearing is that this is -- Again, these are my words; not yours.

I'm using a layman's term here. If we're catching

up to where we should be, do we then anticipate -I'm trying to look for if this kind of increase is
going to come year after year, or is the --

I understand the modernization is kind of a -- not a one-time thing, but it's -- it's for right now as we -- as we implement.

But as we look at the other half of that GGO request, is that going to be consistently jumping up? Are you saying, well, this will get us to about half of where we need to be --

DIRECTOR MATTIS: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: -- and then the next time we're going to go for more, or are you going for one big swing right now?

DIRECTOR MATTIS: We're going for the big swing trying to get it under control where it needs to be, and then we'll be able to kind of be relying on current year dollars going forward.

REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: But as we look then, as we develop this budget product, and I know, obviously, it's hard because this is what you asked for. But, do you believe that there is a number that is less than that that can move us towards that direction, or are we going to continue to be backed up, in your opinion, if we don't hit

1 that number? 2 DIRECTOR MATTIS: We can certainly look into it. This does keep our elections area, you 3 know, healthier. That's a lot of unknowns in that 4 5 -- in that arena. So, making sure that we are in a 6 place where we can cover all the expenses that are 7 coming in, that's kind of where we are because --REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: 8 Madam Secretary, I know you wanted to --10 DIRECTOR MATTIS: We have been relying 11 on other sources. 12 REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: Okay. Thank 13 you. 14 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: I have to say that 15 coming into this Department in 2018, I was actually 16 shocked how small the elections team was, managing 17 67 counties' elections. And upon further review, 18 it had been cut over the last decade significantly. 19 You know, I think this is, obviously, 20 the year to make sure that we have the resources to 21 provide the counties with every single bit of 22 training and support we possibly can. But we're 23 always exploring --

So like the new voter registration

system, no. The move to replace the old voter

2.4

registration system with the new one, and I think
you've -- you've seen we planning to do that in
2021. We already have an RFP that's out there. So
we're still working from a voter registration
system that was installed in what, 2002?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: 2003 through
2005 it was phased in.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So that, like many old systems actually costs more to run than it should. So, actually, going to a new system, though, it has the one-time cost, is gonna end up costing less, hopefully, overtime, and we're not at the end of the bid process yet.

So the plan -- The actual moving forward to the new systems can help us then save money over time. But we need the investment now in order to make sure, as asked earlier, not to be the Iowa, because Iowa -- Even though Pennsylvania has nothing to do with what Iowa did, like, that was run by party, not by election officials, and there's a million reasons why we're different.

But the one thing that's really the same is that, preparation, training, testing; preparation, training, testing. We need to be making sure that counties have access to every bit

1 of support we can give them. REPRESENTATIVE TOPPER: All right. 2 Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: 4 Thank 5 you, Representative. 6 Next will be Representative McCarter. 7 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Good morning. REPRESENTATIVE McCARTER: Hello, Madam 8 9 Secretary. And again, thank you for being here 10 today with your team. 11 Again, thank you for all your efforts 12 also in trying to carry out, I think, the will of 13 this Legislature in trying to modernize the 14 election system, which I think is a critical element, obviously, with so much riding on, not 15 16 only the election, but I think the very basic 17 nature of democracy itself. 18 With that in mind, in a sense, with the 19 anticipated influx of the mail-in and absentee 20 ballots, the increase we expect in that area, will 21 counties be permitted to canvass or count the 22 ballots prior to the 8 clock closing time on 23 election night? 24 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: I'm gonna take this 25 opportunity to thank those of you who have been

involved. I know there's been conversations between the Department of State and the Administration and the Legislature, both parties on changing the -- changing Act 77 to actually provide more flexibility to counties to do more actions before Election Day. So I think -- Two-part answer.

One, under our current law, there is -there are actions that the counties can take before
Election Day, such as, so when they get the mail-in
and absentee ballots, they can look at, as you all
probably know, on the outside of the outer envelope
there's the information on who the voter is. They
can check their eligibility. They can determine
whether they're mail-in or absentee. They could
provide lists to party and candidate watchers so
that they could figure out whether there's gonna be
a challenge to any of them or not.

But, they can't start opening envelopes until after 8 p.m. on election night, and that holds it up. So, what we'd love to see is more along the lines of what we see in other states where there are more steps that can be done in the weeks leading up to Election Day. That will give the counties ability to take care of the ones that

come in early; get those done and then move forward on the rest, so that, really on Election Day -- or after Election Day, you know, that night starting, they'll have a much smaller class to count.

So, hopefully, we all share -- I think my sense is that we all share the desire to make it easier for counties to get this done on election night.

The other thing that we're doing --

In addition, please encourage your counties to buy all high-speed, high-capacity scanners that they need to get this done, because the new scanners are amazing. These high-capacity scanners they can go 5, 10 -- I think there's some that do more than 10,000 ballots an hour. If you have one of those, it's only that many. If you have three of them, it's three times that many, and that's third the number of hours that it will take to count. We're reimbursing counties under the Act 77 bond for those scanners, so they're included in the reimbursement. Please encourage your counties to buy every piece of equipment they need to get this done.

REPRESENTATIVE McCARTER: Well, thank you very much for that answer.

Again, in terms of the second part that goes along with that, there's also, I think, in the act it requires a -- it says notice of time and place for -- when the canvassing of absentee and mail-in ballots will take place, but it doesn't provide the instructions on how to do that.

How will the Department, in a sense, clarify that notice process?

mean, we're very close in touch with the counties on how that all works and the processes that, you know, that create efficiencies, how to do this well. And again, if the law is changed to allow more to happen before Election Day, we'll -- we'll revise all our guidance to provide that.

You know, the good news about, you know, not being first is that we're not first. There are more three other states that have been having some form of mail-in voting that's not just absentee for years, if not decades. And so, there's a lot of good models out there.

Again, my hope is that, I think we all share the desire to make it even easier to do more before Election Day, and I think there's a lot of good ways to do that. But, whatever it is, as it

1 exists now or whether it's changed to allow more 2 before Election Day, we're gonna be working closely with the counties to make sure they have the 3 suggestions on most effective processing as 4 possible. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE McCARTER: Thanks so much 7 for the clarifications. Thank you. SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: 8 Thank you. 9 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank 10 you, Representative. 11 Next will be Representative Heffley. 12 REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Thank you. 13 Just real quick. Just following up on a 14 couple of things. The Governor decertified the 15 voting machines in 2018 for the 2019 election. 16 Prior to that, had there ever been any issues with 17 the elections brought, you know, with the machines 18 that we had? 19 Our county operated fine. I mean, we --20 There was no issues. The machines worked fine. 2.1 People were comfortable with them. And it was a 22 huge expense to the counties. I mean, we just 23 spent \$150 million approximately across the state to buy all new machines because we had a system 24

that worked fine. Maybe some people weren't

exactly happy with the results in certain elections. I can say I'm not always happy as well.

It seemed like a huge expense and unnecessary and unneeded mandate on our counties. That money could have went to fund so many other needed programs.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Which county are you from, Representative?

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Carbon County, the 122nd District. And it's a -- I mean, we have the opioid epidemic. We have -- many issues where that money could have otherwise been used.

We had a system that never had an issue. And yet, the first time we used the new voting machines, there were a lot of issues with them, and triggering to the point of actually a hand recount, which then verified that the machines were running accurately.

But to get back to the expense, in that the state is only picking up 60 percent. CCAP was opposed to decertifying the machines, correct?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Well, no. CCAP was working with -- was trying to figure out the right timeline to do it. So, as -- I'm not sure if you were here earlier, so this is a movement --

Pennsylvania was one of about 12 states remaining that did not have moderate sys --

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: I would say we had a -- we had a very modern system. Actually, we went way back with it. I mean, now we've got --

There is no longer the integrity of a private ballot, right? One of the great things about our democracy is that, when you went to vote, nobody knew who you -- when you got behind that curtain, so to speak, nobody knew who you were voting for.

Now with this new system, everybody can see, when you go in that scanner, when you scan they can see who you're voting for. I think that -- I think that was a big step backwards.

My thing is, we had a system that was not compromised. There was no foreign interference. It was all a bunch of baloney coming out of D.C. We have a system that now cost the Commonwealth a lot of money, right, a lot of money that could have otherwise been used. And I think we're disenfranchising so many voters who don't like the new system because it's not -- it's not a secure ballot. Other people can see how they voted.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, a number of things. I mean, again, President Trump is one of the primary proponents of the move to paper ballot voting systems, the new voting system. So we work very closely with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee, FBI, national security experts across the country who all, who all, every one of them, wanted every state in the country to move forward to new voting systems; meaning, current security standards with voter verifiable paper ballot.

Just so that we're clear, this is not something that was individualized to Pennsylvania.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: It was, in that, we were forced to -- to provide that funding and change election process that didn't work -- that worked fine for many years.

So, just to also -- Back to the hand counting of the paper ballots, we've seen the circus that developed in '04 and 2000, the elections where they subjectively hand counted hanging chads and all the other chaos.

What would trigger a statewide hand recount of these paper ballots, 'cause hand recounts could be very subjective?

2.1

1 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yeah. No. I mean, 2 there's an automatic recount when you have a race that's less than half of a percent difference 3 between the winner and the loser. 4 REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: But that's not 5 6 a hand read. They're not hand-counted ballots. They're just looking over the tallies. 7 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So under the --8 under the current law, the language, I believe, and 10 Jonathan could confirm, is that, it needs to be 11 done by a different manner than it was computed on 12 Election Day; is that correct? 13 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: Correct. Ιf 14 you're -- So I want --The first thing I want to do, we're not 15 16 talking about ballots that are hand counted. 17 are hand marked many of them. Some are machine 18 marked using a ballot-marking device, but they're 19 actually tabulated by scanners. 20 REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: But the premise 21 to have the paper trail was, if there was a 22 question they would count those by hand with a 23 paper trail. What would trigger that? 24 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: Well, what

would trigger it is a request for a recount.

Now, the half of percent, the statewide

-- The statutory provision for the statewide

recount and for any recount, even one that's

requested, requires that the recount be conducted

with equipment or a machine different than the one

used to do the initial count. So, it wouldn't

necessarily have to be a hand recount, but that is

one option that's available.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: It would be rescanned, but not with the same scanner?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: With a different scanner.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: We haven't -- We haven't made it -- Yeah, some of it's gonna depend on what we decide, you know, and this is collective. These are conversations that we want to be having with the Legislature about what the new post-election audit process should look like.

But the recount -- the automatic recount provision, how we're going to word that language is gonna be something we're going to want to talk with you about as well because, obviously, a full hand count takes resources and has a whole different level of --

1	REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Yeah. I just
2	My concern is the mandate, the unfunded
3	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR:
4	Representative
5	REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: mandate.
6	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: can
7	you please wrap up?
8	REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Yes. They
9	already had to hire extra employees for these
10	election offices across the state. I'm just
11	concerned about that additional burden and cost on
12	the county. Thank you.
13	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank
14	you.
15	Next will be Representative Krueger.
16	REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: Thank you,
17	Mr. Chairman.
18	Thank you so much, Madam Secretary, for
19	joining us here today. I really appreciate all of
20	the questions that you've answered so far. I hear
21	concerns from my constituents in Delaware County
22	about election security, and I'm grateful for the
23	steps that you and the Administration are taking on
24	this issue.
25	I want to ask about special elections

We are currently 10 weeks until the primary, and yet, there will be four special elections happening in this time on a date not scheduled during the presidential primary. There's one February 25th, and then there are three scheduled for March 17th. And we know that the dates for special elections are completely at the discretion of the Speaker of the House, so the Speaker has chosen to put these four special elections on dates that are not concurrent with the presidential primary, despite some of the counties who are going to be holding these special elections who petitioned the Speaker to hold them concurrent with the presidential primary when they're gonna have the machines out; the operation is already in place. Can you tell us, what is the approximate cost to taxpayers for one special election that's not held on a regular election? SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, on average a House race is approximately a hundred to \$150,000

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, on average a House race is approximately a hundred to \$150,000 apiece and the Senate race approximately 150 to 200,000 apiece. Is that right, Kim?

DIRECTOR MATTIS: Yes.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: One hundred fifty to 200,000 apiece. And don't forget the one in

1

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

January. So there were five special elections between the general and the primary.

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: Okay. So a hundred to 150,000 apiece. And if we've got four happening in that time, so you'd multiply that number by four, so we talking 400 to \$600,000 of taxpayer dollars being spent.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: So I know, I often hear from folks in my district who are really concerned about fraud, waste and abuse. This seems like a waste of taxpayer dollars. What can the Legislature do to ensure that we're no longer wasting taxpayer dollars by scheduling special elections on dates where they don't really need to be held?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: You know, I think you could change the law to require more stringent grounds for any time it's not decided -- for it to stray from being on an already scheduled Election Day or primary. And I -- I don't recall the exact language of the current provisions. Jonathan, do you?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: I don't recall off the top of my head. But it does -- it does

allow -- it does allow for it to be scheduled on 1 2 the date of a regularly-scheduled primary election, but it doesn't necessarily bind, in this case, 3 Speaker of the House or, you know, the Lieutenant Governor in the Senate from putting it on another 5 day if he or she believes it's necessary to have it 6 on a date earlier than that. The only limitation is, it can't be less 8 than 60 days from the date that the writ of the 10 election is issued. 11 REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: And my 12 understanding is that, with all -- all four of 13 these vacancies, that there was more than 60 days 14 and it could have been scheduled on the 15 presidential primary if we had chosen. 16 Thank you so much. I appreciate what 17 you're doing. I think the Legislature needs to 18 consider taking action here to make sure we're not 19 wasting the funds of our taxpayers. 20 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you. 21 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: 22 Representative Delozier. 23 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2.4

Madam Secretary, thank you for being

here and with the folks from the Department of State. I know it's a big job you guys will have dealing with this election coming up. But I want to get back to the licensure boards.

The issue of -- That was brought up about calls into our office, obviously, is a big issue. But, specifically, the purpose of the boards is my understanding--And this is just kind of a yes or no--is the safety of those that they serve, correct?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Okay. So with that being said, a little while ago the Acting Commissioner mentioned the fact of -- and brought up the bill, which actually is my bill, House Bill 1477, and stated that the Department of State is against the bill, which was news to me. And, actually, the Governor's Office because they weren't aware that you were against it either.

So, can I ask, you mentioned the issue of moving the burden of the person to prove that they are not a danger to the individual. Can you specifically tell me what in the bill does that?

ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: So my understanding of the bill is that, the individual

2.1

```
1
      has -- the individual who has been -- who has
 2
      the --
 3
                 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Who has a
      record.
 4
                 ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON:
 5
                                                Has to --
 6
      has then to make a showing that they're no longer
 7
      -- no longer --
                 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: A threat to
 8
 9
      the public.
10
                 ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Propose a
11
      threat to the public.
                 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Correct.
12
13
                 So, are you against it because we
14
      shouldn't be asking --
15
                  The board's role is safety of the people
16
      with whom they serve. That is what this is
      allowing them to do is to say to this individual
17
18
      who has a criminal record to show how they've been
19
      rehabilitated. So the ability for them, you don't
20
      think the individual should show that they have
      been rehabilitated?
2.1
22
                 ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON:
                                                 Well,
23
      currently, the -- the bureau has a policy that's
      currently in place that allows an individual to
24
      show evidence of rehabilitation.
25
```

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: So this isn't changing, that issue is asking as to what they have done?

ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: If you're stating that an individual, who has a prior conviction, based on the prior conviction is a -- is a -- the prior conviction alone is a threat to the public, then my question would be, how does that -- how does that not antithetical to the current -- the current language we created which -- which prohibits the --

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: The language right now says that if they have a conviction, they can automatically just say no without asking a question. So they can simply go back to the individual and say, if they have a felony record, they're automatically declined a state record.

So what we're saying in the bill is the ability to say, you may have a felony that has nothing to do with what it is that you're trying to do, but that board still will have the ability to make sure that the public then, in which they will be serving, will be safe. And you're saying that shouldn't be a question that the board would ask?

ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON:

Key Reporters-

```
1
      Representative, doesn't -- doesn't CHRIA now
 2
      prohibit the board from denying --
 3
                 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Can you pull
      it just a little closer?
 4
                 ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Doesn't --
 5
 6
      Doesn't -- Doesn't the language of the act
 7
      currently prohibit us from denying based solely on
      a criminal conviction, on a --
 8
                 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: As it stands
10
      right now without a change in law, no.
                 ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: You're
11
12
      saying it doesn't?
13
                 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER:
                                            Correct.
                                                      You
14
      can deny someone's license because they have a
      record, correct. That has nothing to do with what
15
16
      it is. It's called the morals clause, the ability
17
      for someone to say, even coming out of prison we're
18
      teaching them how to be barbers and cosmetologists,
19
      but we are denying them their license because they
      have a record, which is a vicious cycle that we're
20
2.1
      trying to break.
22
                 ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON:
                                                That's --
23
      that's -- that's correct. I would disagree with
24
      your interpretation of whether or not a prior
25
      conviction in and of itself is -- is a sole factor
```

1 in denying licensure, because that has not been the 2 policy. 3 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: With this legislation you're saying? 4 I'm saying ACTING COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: 5 6 the current process now, we do not deny based solely on a prior conviction. 7 8 REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: But you can, and that's what we're trying to fix. 10 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yeah. 11 Representative, I want to just clarify that, I 12 don't think -- there's no question that I think we 13 share all the goals. So it's really just which 14 vehicle will better reflect the way that we all can 15 agree. 16 So I want to make it clear, there's no 17 opposition to any particular bill. I think the 18 Senate bill was the -- the vehicle that contained 19 more of the provisions that it was believed to best 20 accomplish those goals. But we definitely would 2.1 love to continue to work with you and the House to

But I want to just make it clear, nobody's opposing. We share the same goals.

make sure we find a vehicle that works for

everybody.

22

23

2.4

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Right. Well,
I guess, and part of the issue would have been the
fact that I would have appreciated hearing as to
what it was specifically with the language, because
we were in back-and-forth conversations with the
Department of State, and we didn't hear about the
issue that, specifically, this language was going
to turn that around and be something where you
would be in opposition to it.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So let's -- If we may, I'll speak with our "Leg." office and ask them to set up a meeting where we can revisit all this, move this forward, because I know we can move this forward and it will make a great difference for Pennsylvania, and let's just figure out what the exact wording is and how to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE DELOZIER: Right.

Because that means the language we have with the 11

-- the issues that an individual may have to prove
that's more -- that does have a record, basically
it's saying what education they maintained outside
of after being incarcerated; how long ago the
effect -- the criminal act happened; what was the
criminal act in and of itself. I mean, all these
things --

2.1

1	I will say this. I've talked to a
2	number of board members, and they very much don't
3	want their ability to make a decision as to whether
4	or not we have safe nurses or safe dentists or safe
5	doctors in our communities serving our public.
6	They don't want that taken away from them in total.
7	So they do want some control over that. They felt
8	that the Senate version took that total control
9	away from them.
10	So, thank you very much.
11	SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you. And
12	let's circle back and find language that works.
13	Appreciate it.
14	ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank
15	you, Representative.
16	Next will be Representative Flynn.
17	REPRESENTATIVE FLYNN: Thank you,
18	Mr. Chairman.
19	My question is for Secretary Boockvar or
20	Commissioner Johnson. It's a licensure question.
21	Part of our job as legislators is kind of helping
22	our constituents serve the state system and get
23	things done where they have problems of their own,
24	like making calls.
25	In the licensure issue I'm facing is, a

lot of the time with people in nursing license is coming out of nursing school, there seems to be a lot of efficiency within the Department in getting their licenses on time. I probably had this problem five or six times with different constituents.

Is there anything the licensure department is doing to kind of streamline that or make it more efficient?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yes. We have been looking at every step of the process, from the very first moment the license is applied for to the very end of the actual granting or denial of the license. So, for example, I'm not sure if you heard about, we created last year --

One of the problems that we found, in addition to there not being the most effective processes internally, was that there was poor communication to stakeholders and licensees for their understanding about how the process works.

So, last year we started exploring ways to kind of break out the entire process in a way that applicants would understand, nursing schools, cosmo programs; every -- everybody would understand. So we created what are called license

navigator guides, and we have up already the first six, and there's three more that are gonna be up any day.

Those nine professions represent already over 55 percent of all the licensees in Pennsylvania. They include cosmo. They include nurses. They include doctors. They include osteos. They include engineers and real estate sales. Barbers are coming in the seven, eight, nine, I think, right? So, a big mix of license classes.

What we did was, we broke it out into three phases. So, because -- To hear kind of a global amount of time doesn't tell you anything or help you figure out how to reduce those time frames.

So the first phrase is, basically, you've submitted -- you're submitting to the Department of State your things, and it's on the Department now to respond to what you might be missing, telling you that you might need specific training or testing, or whatever.

Phase 2 is, we've given you that information as the applicant. Here's all the things you need to do. Criminal -- maybe a

2.1

criminal history test. Maybe you need to take a nursing exam or a cosmo exam, or whatever it is. There's that phase.

And then phase 3 is, you have done all that. You've given it back to Department of State, how much time until we actually issue the license. And what we did was, we created these web pages for each license which tell you how you can reduce the time frame of each phrase.

So, not only are we working on the internal systems, but we're also working on the external communications that you know.

But, for example, nurses were being told by their school, apply before you graduate, but they weren't being told, however, your license is not gonna actually be able to start the process until after you graduate. So people were applying, say, months before they graduated, thinking, well, I should be moving forward, but that wasn't happening because they hadn't graduated.

So, getting information to the applicants -- Still apply early. I will never tell anybody not to apply as early as possible. But understand, here's what you can do before you graduate. You can get a background check. You

could start the process of looking for when you're gonna take an exam. All those things that you could do will minimize each of those phases.

And in the meantime, like I said, we're reducing -- we're reducing our processing times as well.

So, for example, I gave the nursing times, if you look at all of the nine professions that we've put up so far, which again, represent over 55 percent of licensees in Pennsylvania, every one of them has made huge decreases in license processing time since 2018. So, every day I can shave. Every week I could shave we will continue to work on, but it's already been tremendously helpful.

REPRESENTATIVE FLYNN: Then also, we work as catalysts here. As Representatives, we're catalysts for our constituents. We're trying to make the process easier. So, we're gonna call and we're gonna continue to call to help expedite that when it comes time. But, a lot of the time they have problems getting through on the phone. They don't get callbacks. That's the inefficiencies we face as a legislator.

We've had numerous times where they

2.1

said, can you please stop calling back. We're not going to allow that anymore for you to expedite them. I kind of told my staff that, if there are inefficiencies, keep calling.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Absolutely. And I will tell you, so customer service is also one of the things that we're working very strongly on.

I was -- We were surprised to find out last year that there were no voice mails in the boards, which I was floored by. We now have voice mail; like, basic stuff like that. Even the phone tree.

So, for example, nursing. Nursing board, nursing calls had 45-minute wait times; whereas, every other board had a couple-minute wait times. So we looked at the tree; like, literally the phone tree that had been in place for years and years and years, and it was different than every other board. So we said, why don't we change that. And guess what? It's now 3 minutes.

REPRESENTATIVE FLYNN: Thank you.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So across all the boards, all the professions it's 3-minute calls instead of 45, which is great.

REPRESENTATIVE FLYNN: Thank you.

2.1

1 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank 2 you, Representative. Next will be Representative Brown. 3 4 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 6 And thank you, Madam Secretary, and all 7 of you for your information today. Quick couple --Two questions. 8 We touched on a few of the different 10 issues in regards to the voting systems, and the 11 numbers that were given earlier were 6 million 12 people anticipated to vote in the general election; 13 about 45 counties rolled in their new systems --SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Last year. 14 15 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: -- election, 16 right? So we learned a lot of what worked and what 17 didn't work, and I know you mentioned you're 18 communicating strongly with the counties. 19 One thing, and Representative Heffley mentioned it a little bit and a few others here and 20 21

mentioned it a little bit and a few others here and there. But one of the things that was a great concern for my constituents and a lot of feedback, and I specifically experienced it myself, was the privacy issue during the voting process. It was so strong and so evident that I think it really today,

22

23

24

during this hearing, has not been brought up enough.

2.1

The fact of walking in and having the ballot handed to you, to a small table with very low dividers; one table or two tables; people standing on top of you sort of looking down over you, that was just the start. And then, if you were to scan your ballot and it popped back for any reason, you were sometimes handed your ballot back or your ballot was handed to someone else to kind of be floating around. Whether or not it went into a folder eventually and you got a new ballot or -- it was just very, very evident.

And the concerns that I have, and I think I'm speaking for a lot of my people, is, this general election with the volume of people, the privacy, education and training that I think these counties really, really desire and they need, I think they're crunched.

My question to you from the Department of State is, what are the resources -- Now, I know with federal money and the state money combined and they have flexibility for usage, but do they have the resources that they need from you, as the Department of State, for training programs or are

1 you contracting out with third party? A very, very 2 strong concern of mine. SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yeah. And thank 3 you very much for that. 4 May I ask, which county are you with? 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Sure. I have 7 Monroe County and parts of Pike County as well. SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Okay. So you were 8 9 going from -- Monroe was -- You were already doing 10 hand-marked paper or you weren't doing hand-marked 11 paper? 12 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: We weren't. 13 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: You had machines in 14 both. REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: We had machines 15 16 and closed, and it went to an open system. So it 17 was tough on everyone I think to change over, but 18 there was definitely a loss of privacy that was 19 very strong. SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: And I think we 20 21 heard that from a number of places across the 22 Commonwealth. And it's why I thank you, to the 23 Legislature, for working very quickly in November to -- Was it Act 94 where we added increased 24

ability for privacy provisions? I think it was

that change where we all had -- you know, whether it was the lever machines, or a lot of the DRE machines, had that gray curtain that went behind you. It was -- It was -- It's a very different system than a lot of the counties that went to hand-marked paper.

So we very -- We absolutely are going to be providing the reimbursement under the bond for, you know, whether it's curtains and so forth that need to help provide that privacy physically. But then you're absolutely right, the training is a huge, huge part of it.

And so, yes, one of the things that I want to make sure we do as part of the federal dollars as well is, help fund training, whether, again, it's through third parties or vendors providing -- or whoever it is that can help train the poll workers not to invade that personal space.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Right.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: And I think they're
-- you know, they're wonderful people doing good
work; that they don't get paid a tremendous amount
to do it. But what are the current requirements of
training that counties do have to provide and are
we enhancing that is my question, and are they

2.1

getting that resource to have appropriate training so that they can feel confident in the counting level?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yeah. And,

Jonathan, I'm going to ask you whether you've

talked about this recently with counties? I know

you've spoken a lot to York which certainly

experienced this, and actually, I spoke to one of

the county commissioner there last night, and she

was also expressing interest in making sure that

we're providing this information.

I think poll worker training -- you know, it's been part of poll worker training before, but it's a totally different system, right? So if they've used that system once, each time they're using it, they're learning more, and we can be --

Do you want to talk some about your conversations?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: Sure. And a lot of it too -- and we can provide -- The biggest resource -- One of the biggest resources we can provide is guidance. A lot of the issues that we heard, kind of when we drilled down talking to individual counties, and even talking to voters who

filed complaints, the -- the issues related to privacy, a lot of them had to do with polling place layout.

You know, with the old system, polling place layout may not have been as big an issue because the voting booth was completely enclosed.

With this type of voting, you have to look at polling place layout differently and make sure that you don't have voters congregating near other voters. And some of it is simple as making sure that voters understand that when they're done voting their ballot, that they need to place it in the privacy sleeve or privacy folder, whatever is provided by the county. So when they're waiting in line, to scan it into the -- into the precinct scanner, their ballot isn't exposed.

What we learned, a lot of those things were kind of missed during the training or they didn't sink in. So having -- trained poll workers having efficient poll place layout so they don't have voters congregating in areas where other voters are trying to mark their ballot in secrecy I think can do a lot to change the perception that there was a lack of privacy. I think it's really simple things like that, in addition to the

2.1

1 additional equipment and resources the counties 2 need to provide for private atmosphere. REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Right. We're out 3 of time, but thank you so much. I really just want 4 to make sure that they have the resources to have 5 the appropriate training and the appropriate 6 coverage to make sure the voter feels confident. 7 Thank you. 8 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you. 10 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank 11 you, Representative. 12 Next will be Chairman Readshaw. 13 REPRESENTATIVE READSHAW: Thank you, 14 Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, I suppose at this time 15 16 it's appropriate that I wish you a good afternoon. 17 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE READSHAW: It was good 18 19 morning a few hours ago. 20 Fortunately, I suppose, specific to the 21 professional licensing questions that I have had 22 have already been asked and responded to. So I'll 23 spare you the frustrations of the licensing process that we have all experienced. 24

And I believe we -- It would be

1 appropriate that I would ask for all of us, really, 2 that have experienced these frustrations that greater efficiencies be put in place for the 3 I think we owe that to our constituents and all the licensees of the Commonwealth of 5 6 Pennsylvania. So I hope that takes place, would 7 save us a lot of aggravation and extra work. On a personal note, though, I'd like to 8 thank you and everyone at the table for your 10 interaction and cooperation as we waded our way 11 through these problems with licensure. I know that 12 you have cooperated with me and my executive 13 director, Marlene Wilson, on many occasions. So I 14 thank you for that. But just to reiterate, I hope we can 15 16 solve the problems of the past which many, many of 17 them were unnecessary. So, please, greater 18 efficiencies would be appreciated. 19 Thank you for being here. 20 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you, 2.1 Chairman. 22 REPRESENTATIVE READSHAW: Thank you, 23 Mr. Chairman. 24 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank 25 you, Chairman.

1 Next will be Representative Ortitay. 2 REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: Thank you, 3 Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, everyone. I want to 4 follow up on the line of questioning from 5 6 Representative Topper. Director Mattis, you had mentioned, and I just want to make sure I actually heard correctly because I was over here in the 8 corner, that you were using prior year waivers to fund the GGO? 10 11 DIRECTOR MATTIS: That is correct. Our 12 elections bureaus are under our GGO appropriations, so when there's added expenses that weren't 13 14 budgeted for, we are relying on the use of waivers 15 to cover. 16 REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: Do you know how 17 much you used for this current year? 18 DIRECTOR MATTIS: We have a lot of 19 different waiver funding sources from different 20 appropriations. I would say it's probably in 2.1 upwards of about 600,000, give or take. I don't 22 have the exact number off the top of my head, but I 23 can certainly look at that. 24 REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: Yes. Can you 25 get those numbers for us, and then maybe go back a

1 couple years, too, just to see if that's increasing 2 or decreasing? DIRECTOR MATTIS: Absolutely. 3 REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: And can you 4 also provide the Committee a list of where that --5 6 how far those waivers go back and how much money is 7 still available? DIRECTOR MATTIS: 8 Sure. Absolutely. 9 REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: All right. So 10 the other part of the question I wanted to get to, 11 augmented funds. I was trying to look through the 12 budget book that was provided to us. I did see 13 some sections for augmented funds. 14 What's the source of your augmented 15 funds? Where does that come from? 16 DIRECTOR MATTIS: So, under the GGO 17 appropriation? REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: 18 Yes. 19 DIRECTOR MATTIS: Our augmented funds 20 come from our restricted appropriations, so Bureau 2.1 of Professional and Occupational Affairs, State 22 Board of Medicine Osteo-podiatry, State Athletic 23 Commission, Bureau of Corporations and Charitable 24 Organizations. 25 REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: Are you seeing

1 those numbers increase or decrease over the last 2 five years? 3 DIRECTOR MATTIS: What we're doing is, those -- the augmentations themselves are actually 4 decreasing. But the reason for that is what is --5 6 In the past, services such as human 7 resources or information technology services were all funded out of our GGO appropriation. And with 8 the changes to the delivery centers that we now 10 have, what we're doing is, instead of capturing 11 those monies through augmentations into the GGO 12 appropriation, we've actually put those costs in 13 with the perspective appropriations where the work 14 is actually being done. 15 REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: Okay. Are you 16 spending all of that money every year out of that 17 account? 18 DIRECTOR MATTIS: For the most part, 19 yes. It's very close to that. 20 REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: Is there any 21 left over in budgetary reserve from previous years? 22 DIRECTOR MATTIS: There is not. 23 REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: Okay. And that 2.4 is a restricted account. It can only be used for 25 that purpose?

1	DIRECTOR MATTIS: That is correct.
2	REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: Okay. Now, are
3	there any other sources of funding that the
4	Department can get besides from the Federal
5	Government?
6	DIRECTOR MATTIS: No. Just General
7	Fund; restricted dollars and Federal Fund.
8	REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: Do you receive
9	any money from lobbying disclosures? I know
LO	there's a line item in there for lobbying
11	disclosures. But I didn't know if there was a fee
L2	that lobbyists had to pay.
L3	DIRECTOR MATTIS: Yes. Lobbying
L 4	disclosure appropriation does have some General
15	Fund dollars, but there's also funding that they
L 6	pay for their biannual registration fees. That
L7	does help supplement those services.
18	REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: Okay. In the
L 9	Governor's budget proposal, is there a plan to use
20	any more of the waivers to fund your operation
21	moving forward in the next budget year?
22	DIRECTOR MATTIS: For elections or
23	anything like that? No.
24	REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: For anything in
25	your GGO for the Department of State.

1 DIRECTOR MATTIS: Absolutely not. 2 What we try and do is, when we submit our budget, we try and show it for what services we 3 need. 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE ORTITAY: Okay. All right. Thank you very much. I'll look forward to 6 7 the list. DIRECTOR MATTIS: You're welcome. 8 9 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank you, Representative. 10 11 Next will be Representative Struzzi. 12 REPRESENTATIVE STRUZZI: Thank you, 13 Mr. Chairman. I know it's running late here, so 14 I'll try to make this very brief. 15 My question, or my concern I guess, and 16 I think I will ask you to state this for some 17 reassurance to the people back in my district, 18 we've spent a lot of time talking about the 19 security of the machines themselves. 20 But my question is, the validity of the 21 voter. A lot of people have asked me in the 22 district, why don't we check IDs when people go to 23 vote. Can you go over the process of how we're 24 going to validate the mail-in ballots? I.e., are

the people sending them in, actually, the people

1 sending them in? Thank you. 2 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yeah. Actually, 3 Jonathan Marks has been with the elections team of Department of State for -- He gets mad at me if I 4 tell you about how long. 5 6 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: I'm qonna --7 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: I'm going to ask him to go through because he knows all the details. 8 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: Mail-in 10 ballots, just like absentee ballots now, there's a 11 very specific voter identification requirement. 12 Basically, whichever one you request, you have to 13 provide either your driver's license or the last 14 four digits of your Social Security number, and 15 they have to match. If they don't match, your 16 absentee ballot can't be accepted unless you 17 provide some valid form of identification. That's 18 how we're ensuring that those ballots are, you 19 know, cast by the individual who requested them. 20 REPRESENTATIVE STRUZZI: Okav. 21 you. 22 ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank 23 you, Representative. 24 Next will be Representative Greiner. 25 REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

2.1

Kind of lightning round real quickly, following up with some other colleagues.

Representative Lawrence, you and I spoke about Lancaster County. We were in really good shape I felt, too. But, I know how the newspaper handles things and I know Representative Lawrence and the issue.

But, according to an article this morning from the Post, in yesterday's court testimony you testified if a judge would ultimately order decertification of newly-purchased voting machines, the counties likely would be the best to determine how to handle that.

I wanted to give you a chance maybe to quickly talk about that, because I do think, in my mind, I think the buck stops with the Department of State. I wanted to maybe get some feedback on that to begin with.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Sure. And again, that question specifically related to if it was going to be decertified in time for the primary, so that's what the discussion was. What's going to happen, like, tomorrow.

As I mentioned, the good news is that,

the plaintiff said, actually, we don't actually want to move it to be decertified before the primary, so that's off the table.

But, in general, under Pennsylvania law
-- Forget about yesterday. But, in general, the
state certifies the voting systems, but the
counties have the -- have the authority to select
what method they choose. So it is by statute,
really, a partnership between the two. So this
would not be like that, good luck. Go figure it
out. This would be a combined effort.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: That's always the problem when you have testimony and things hit the newspaper. I wanted to clarify that.

Second question. I know we talked about recounts. I think it's 2 percent or 2000 or -
SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: For the audit.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Oh, for the audit. You talked about models moving forward on what we're going to do as far as counting, and you're gonna be discussing them or thinking about them. Is that something that's gonna be in place for the primary?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: No. So, no. Sorry. Did you finish your question?

1 REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: That's fine. 2 That's good. 3 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: So, there's couple different -- So, there are counties -- As I 4 mentioned, last year two counties did pilot post-5 6 election audits, which, again, is not -- They're pilots, right, so they're trying to establish -help in working with us with the work group to see 8 what methods work, what -- what statutory -- like, 10 what statutory direction we may want to go. 11 But for the primary and for the general, 12 nothing's going to change in terms of what's 13 required by the counties. The counties still have 14 the mandatory 2 percent or 2000 ballots that's required by statute. And again, that's not taking 15 16 the place of counting all hundred percent of the 17 ballots. That's an extra audit to make sure that 18 the machines are working; that the tabulated votes 19 on election night actually match the real thing. REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: So the model is 20 21 going to change, though, or not going to --22 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: It's not going to 23 change for this year, no. 24 REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Not even for --25 not even for the general election?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: No. I mean, so what we may do is -- what we're going to be doing is doing more pilots of alternatives, but that's on top of the requirements. So the pilots are really just -- like any pilot, to help us figure out where we might want to go from here.

But this is where we want to be working with the Legislature to figure out -- We're gonna provide to you what the work group, which, again, is a mix of counties in the state, what we would recommend as the direction we go in after we do some more piloting and see what works. But then, this is going to be a collective conversation beyond 2020 what we think should be required going forward.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Okay. Then one last question or follow-up was from my colleague, Representative Martina White, on the -- But the voting centers in itself, you know, when we have the people, Americans with disabilities or people with disabilities voting and helping them, are we going to get some guidance?

I mean, I do think these centers -- The term vote harvesting came up. I know that we -- You say you weren't sure, but I know what that is.

2.1

That's when you kind of try to get people to vote.

You're kind of doing something. It's kind of a

push.

And I'm wondering, are we going to have some rules and guidelines and maybe some legal guidance on how these voting centers 'cause, you know, can do, what they're trying to accomplish at these centers? Because they aren't necess -- I do think they could -- You know, we don't know. They could be taking the ballots.

We talked about integrity of filling in and then they get the ballots and things like that. I mean, I do think -- All I'm going to say is, I think that's an area that I think I like to have a greater understanding as they start to pop up. I think it's something over and beyond the legislation that we passed. Also, I want to be able to protect that integrity and the integrity of the people that are voting.

And I do think -- You both said. I actually think this could be more of a legal -- I think there could be some legal questions here with -- with what's moving forward. I --

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Yes. I mean,
Act 77 didn't change the fact that for regular --

2.1

1 for most voters, aside from voters with disabilities, it doesn't change. You never could 2 have somebody else deliver your ballot for 3 absentee. It was never authorized. It's still not 4 authorized. So, it didn't -- it didn't expand 5 6 that. 7 The only thing it expanded is for people on a hos -- say people in a hospital, one agent --8 Are you all right? Do you want some water? (Comment to Deputy Secretary Marks). Sure. 10 11 The Department of State official --12 DEPUTY SECRETARY MARKS: I'll live. 13 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: -- one last sip of 14 water. Sorry. So, one of the -- one of the advances 15 16 from Act 77 is that, if you say, for example, have 17 a bunch of people in the hospital, none of whom 18 could vote, one person could collect the ballots 19 from a number of different patients if they're

authorized. Again, like, it's very specific to people with disabilities or illnesses who have designated that person.

But, for everybody else, it never was permitted; it's still not permitted. We're going to continue to make sure that's clear, but your

20

21

22

23

24

help with that is appreciated.

REPRESENTATIVE GREINER: Absolutely. We want to protect the integrity. Thank you so much for your time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman:

ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank you, Representative.

That is all the members. We will go to Chairman Bradford for comments.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: Thank you, Chair. I want to follow up real briefly, if I can, on a couple of things.

I think the gentle lady from Monroe, I think raised some very legitimate concerns, obviously, as you're dealing with the new vote machines. There are just issues that the counties are dealing at the individual polling places, I think they're very sincere.

I actually was telling George here, we had some of those same growing pains in Montgomery Country with the open file and people -- you know, the machine rejects the ballot and then people are seeing whose -- other people's ballots. So, I totally get that. I think there's legitimate concerns.

I think the gentle lady is right to mention that. I also think Representative Greiner, some of his concerns just about how Act 77 will play out. It's very legitimate, and I think those are discussions that we need to have.

Conversely, there's a couple things that were said that, I think, a little hyperbolic today and a little bit conspiratorial and, I don't want to say tinfoil hat because I told George I won't use that term, but I may have --

But I think we -- Very succinctly, vote harvesting, the idea that third parties are going to be helping nondisabled individuals deliver ballots, will that be allowed in this election?

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: No. Absolutely not.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: Vote counting. Are we going to count every vote, or are we going to use some statistical anomaly? Because I want to tell the old ladies at the Worcester community building that they're not going to be doing some heavy math; that they're just going to be counting ballots.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Every single vote will be counted.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN BRADFORD: Okay.

One of the other issues that was raised, and I would just make the inverse argument, was, that we need to replace this equipment every

15 years. The gentleman rightfully points out it's only used twice a year, so why are we doing this?

I don't want to make light of it, but I think the -- the analogy I would make, because I live near a nuclear power plant, they don't use the backup system thankfully very often, but they replace it constantly. It's an issue of the highest importance.

I realize there's a cost to our counties. I realize there's a cost to all of us, but there's a very real reason why we're doing it. I think we just need to recognize that when we lose sight of things, because I think sometimes people take it too far.

Speaking of taking it too far, the last point I would mention is the issue of election interference, and kind of, why are we at this spot and needing new machines. I think it's crazy, in our current political discourse, that we can't concede that there was election interference, for

whatever reason because of our national political climate. So I think it's worth repeating.

Senator Richard Burr, who is a

Republican from the State of North Carolina who's
the Chairman of the Intelligence Committee in his
report states very succinctly:

In 2016, the U.S. was unprepared at all levels of government for a concerted attack from a determined foreign adversary on our election infrastructure. Since then, we have learned much more about the nature of Russia cyber activities and better understand the real and urgent threat they post. The Department of Homeland Security and state and local elected officials have dramatically changed how they approach election security, working together to bridge gaps and information sharing and shore up vulnerabilities.

The process they've made over the last three years is a testament to what we can accomplish when we give people the opportunity to be part of a solution. There's still much work that needs to be done. However, I am grateful to the many states that have provided their points of view which help inform our recommendations. It's my hope that the Senate Intelligent Committee's

2.1

bipartisan report will provide the American people with a valuable insight into the election security threat still facing our nation and the ways we can address them.

I would succinctly say, the gentleman from Carbon, that's not baloney. That's actually the words of the Senate Intel Chair.

Now, he also, under key findings and recommendations, I think it's important to point out. Russian activities demand renewed attention of vulnerabilities in U.S. voting infrastructure. Cyber security for electoral infrastructure at the state and local level was sorely lacking in 2016.

Parenthetical, 2016 we had a Democratic President. I think we had a Democratic Governor here in Pennsylvania. This isn't a Democrat or a Republican thing. Elections really need to be beyond the pale.

Going on with the quote:

Despite increased focus over the last three years, some of these vulnerabilities, including aging voting equipment, remain. As states look to replace machines that are now out of date, they should purchase more secure voting machines. At a minimum, any machine purchased

2.1

going forward should have a voter verified paper trail.

Going on:

Congress should evaluate the results of the \$38 million in state election security grants allocated in 2018. States should be able to use grants -- grant funds provided under the Help America Vote Act, HAVA, to improve cyber security in a variety of ways, including hiring additional I.T. staff, updating software, and contracting vendors provide cyber security services.

When these funds are spent, Congress should elevate (sic) the results -- should evaluate the results, sorry, and consider an additional appropriation to address remaining infrastructure of voting machines and systems.

Again, I realize this is -- this has been longer than probably the typical wrap-up, and I want to thank my Republican colleague for giving me the time. But I think we should be mindful that the Department of State and the work you do is very important, and we're glad you're doing it. I think there couldn't be a better person to be doing this.

Whether we like the results of the election -- I know I didn't like the results of the

last presidential election. They are what they are, but people need to have faith that our elections are run in a nonpartisan, appropriate, and professional way. I know George and I were having that very discussion.

So, when those who would sow seeds of doubt, talk about vote harvesting and ACORN and crazy things that may pop up on the Internet, I think they do a disservice. I think we should have a very honest discussion about the challenges we face, what this Administration with our Federal Government partners are doing to secure our next election. And I want to thank you for taking the time to put it out there today.

Thank you.

SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you,

Chairman. Really appreciate it.

ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: Thank you, Chairman.

Briefly, because he was very brief, so I'll be very brief as well.

Act 77, which many of us support and many of us voted for, it removes so many barriers to voting. It made so many changes. And sometimes change is difficult, and sometimes people are

2.1

resistant to change. Many people are resistant to change.

So, for all of us, when we go back home, we hear from our constituents. We hear all the concerns that everybody has, those conspiratorial things that the Chairman had mentioned, and you want to be able to answer questions properly. I believe the good Chairman reframed some of those arguments, or I would call them discussions, and elaborate a little bit more than we were actually at.

I think what we tried to accomplish today is find out where do we stand; where do you stand? What do you need to do to ensure fair and safe elections, and what can we do to help? I think that's what we were trying to accomplish today. And I think we got the answers. You told us -- In regards to what the good Chairman said, you told us the firewall worked.

I mean, what we are trying to do is to make sure what else needed to be -- what else needed to happen. There's still going to be some hiccups and there's still gonna be some problems. We all realize that. But whatever we can do to help in order to ensure a fair and safe election,

2.1

1 we appreciate your time and your answers. 2 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you. appreciate that as well. 3 And I would encourage any -- all of you, 4 I really -- we appreciate when you reach out to us 5 6 and say, hey, the county commissioners in my county or constituents, or whatever, have -- are asking me these questions. You know, can you come and speak 8 or can you give us -- tell us the answers? 10 happy to follow up. 11 I agree with you a hundred percent. 12 77 and all new voting systems, there's lots of 13 great, great changes, but they are changes. And 14 so, we're happy to help in every way we can to make 15 sure that the voters have the information they need 16 and the election officials. 17 So, thank you for --ACTING MAJORITY CHAIRMAN DUNBAR: 18 And I 19 think that's what we all need to do here is to have all the voters have that same level of confidence. 20 21 Again, we thank you for the time. We're 22 going to adjourn, and we will be back at 1:30. 23 Thank you. 24 SECRETARY BOOCKVAR: Thank you.

1 CERTIFICATE 2 I, Karen J. Meister, Reporter, Notary 3 Public, duly commissioned and qualified in and for 4 5 the County of York, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and 6 7 accurate transcript, to the best of my ability, of 8 a public hearing taken from a videotape recording, 9 and reduced to computer printout under my 10 supervision. 11 This certification does not apply to any 12 reproduction of the same by any means unless under 13 my direct control and/or supervision. 14 15 16 17 Karen J. Meister Reporter, Notary Public 18 19 20 21 22 23

2.4