

Douglas Kellner: My name is Douglas Kellner; co-chairman and I call the meeting to order.

Peter Kosinski: I'm Peter Kosinski.

Gregory Peterson: Gregory Peterson.

Andy Spano: Andy Spano.

Douglas Kellner: Alright so we'll start with approval of the minutes of the meeting of September 15th, we have regular minutes and minutes of the Executive Session. Is there a motion?

Andy Spano: Moved.

Gregory Peterson: Second.

Douglas Kellner: All those in favor say "Aye". (Chorus of ayes; 4-0) opposed? Alright the minutes are approved.

We'll start with the unit reports; co-executive directors Robert Brehm and Todd Valentine.

Bob Brehm: Well there are a few issues leading up to the election and still dealing with the aftermath of the last election. On September 20th, we were asked to join a nationwide call to get preliminary briefing from the US Department of Homeland Security with State Election Directors and Secretary's of State depending upon the state make up. At that time, they informed us that there would be individual calls on Friday September 22nd where the Department of Homeland Security would tell every state whether they were one of the states mentioned publicly as having detected Russian hacking into their election systems or their computer systems. They were not interested in giving a list or giving any more information other than you were either going to get a "yes" or a "no". New York received that call on September 22nd. We were in the "no" category, I think that's good that we weren't. But there's still a series of questions that we have with regard to how did they come to that information? Are there any lessons learned that we can use going forward? Homeland Security said they would get back to us and we haven't heard from them since that call in September so we're hopeful they will.

There are a number of other activities. We have a vacancy...

Peter Kosinski: Let me ask you a question about that Bob, I'm rather curious. So, was the assertion they were making was that this was limited to whether or not there was an attempt made to hack or whether there was a successful attempt made to hack? Was this limited to whether it was the Russians that were attempting to hack or whether others may have been involved in attempted hacking? How did that conversation go?

Todd Valentine: Well, they used the term "targeted", that the election itself was "targeted". As to the methods used, they say they were common methods, but they assure us that during that

period right before the election that they were clear that it was the Russian government that was behind the attempt to target influencing the election. And it's still unclear whether that target was directly aimed at a Board of Elections or some other infrastructure within the state so then influence the election, like the network behind it or something like that because again, they're not sharing specific information.

Peter Kosinski: Well, when they said "no", when the answer was "no" to New York, was it there was no attempt made or "no", there was no successful attempt made?

Todd Valentine: There was no evidence of any targeting...

Peter Kosinski: of even trying...

Todd Valentine: ...by the Russians.

Peter Kosinski: So, they're saying there was not even an attempt...

Robert Brehm: ...last year...

Todd Valentine: ...last year....

Peter Kosinski: ...to hack into the...

Bob Brehm: They did not detect.

Douglas Kellner: "Known attempt" and that's to be distinguished from prior reports that we've been given that there was probing of our Voter Registration system.

Todd Valentine: Oh yes, that there's been during that time period...there has been...apparently not attributed to the Russians so.

Peter Kosinski: So, they were limiting this to only whether the Russians had attempted.... So, they did not discuss any other entities attempts to hack into our election system? That wasn't discussed on the call?

Todd Valentine: Not on that call, no. Solely the focus...

Peter Kosinski: So, is that a separate call as to whether there was any other attempt made? I mean are we going to know whether any other entity tried to or successfully did hack into our system.

Todd Valentine: Well, I don't know.

Bob Brehm: There have been a number of conversations to ask those questions and that information has not been forthcoming other than probing, in general, happens to computer

networks, but to attribute it to bad actors they're general reaction is this is what they have stated publicly were attributable to Russians. That doesn't mean that other bad actors might not also be doing things; they didn't tell us that. We did ask but we don't have that information and that information is limited to last election. There is no further information since the last election. So, whether they are only detecting during elections for federal office, or not, is hard to say. Because there's no new information. I mean there's a number of issues regarding how they are standing up to improve communication with states that are ongoing. I know Todd and Tom attended a meeting in Atlanta where they're trying to stand up the panel of persons or states to give them advice on how to set up that communication. It seems like you know there's a lot of work to do to share information better, so I think from our perspective, we're participating, but we are hopeful that it happens sooner rather than later. But it seems like it's in line to have something in place for the 2020 Presidential. It doesn't seem like they're on a trajectory to even be better by the 2018 federal election. So, there's a lot of work we continue to do on our own hoping that it will bring fruit later.

We did certify a vacancy in the 102nd Assembly District in addition to our cyber work. Peter Lopez the Assemblyman in AD 102 resigned on October 10th, I think it was Saturday, so we had to certify the vacancy on the following Monday or Tuesday. He is EPA, was appointed, regional EPA, so he started that. Because it happened after the deadline the vacancy is not on this November's ballot. So, it will either be a next year issue or a special election which I think if my calculations already next year anyway almost. And then we have 3 vacancies that we previously certified that were this year there's Senate 26, AD 24 and AD 71, those will appear on the November ballot, as not a special but just to fill the remainder of the term.

And you can mention your trip to Atlanta.

Todd Valentine: Well, related to cyber security the next step they're taking is a designation of elections as a subsector of the government Critical Infrastructure designation and what they do is the first thing you do is set up a charter or group of who you want included in the government, who's covered by the government so that's state, local and federal. There are representatives from all 3 levels. The State Election Directors have a selection, Secretaries of State because they also run elections, there's the IGO, which is the local government officials group, and Election Center had people there in addition to Homeland Security, FBI, and EAC. And that's called the Government Coordinating Council is to set up what are the processes for distributing information when the federal government has it or when the locals must go up the food chain. It's in its infancy and Bob's correct. At the pace that they're going, they don't see any rush to target this year's election even though there are elections every year nor are they really pushing to get anything really stood up formally for next year's election. They're ready to provide some resources to help states and local governments to assess their own networks and their own capability as far as security is concerned and we're going to try to take advantage of those to the extent that we can. But the problem still remains a question of intelligence that they're gathering information but they're not necessarily sharing all the details and we've been quite up front to them that that's a problem because you're asking me to set up a defense, but I have no idea what I'm defending against. So, I don't know how to build a wall if that's what I've got to build. Or

if I've got to build a net over the roof if they're dropping in by helicopter, I have no idea. And they promise they'll get better. I'm not hopeful in the near future but....

Peter Kosinski: Well my guess is these things are going to be changing all the time anyway. They're not going to know because as you devise a defense to one type of hacking I suppose they create a new one. So, Todd I don't think you're ever going to know what you're defending against that's my guess. You're going to have to try to create a system that's secure as it can be to defend against any number of potential attempts.

Todd Valentine: Well, I think I would know what happened last year.

Peter Kosinski: But that may not tell you what's going to happen next year. So, I mean I can just see where it's difficult to get a handle or your arms around what is the threat here?

Douglas Kellner: Can you talk about the budget requests?

Bob Brehm: It was our major effort we've been working since the spring with our own assessment of the risks at the county level and our own infrastructure with cyber security. On June 20th the Governor appointed a panel or he has a panel of individuals that serve as advisors on cyber security. He tasked them with doing a report within 90 days on methods to make elections secure. We have had many conversations with representatives of the group. We had a couple of conversations with the group as to what we need to do. We're working with our staff and talking with the Governor's panel; we basically came up with a list of items that we think we need to do to protect the election and came up with cost estimates and we have submitted a budget that would allow us to do the items on that task list of monitoring, working with the counties to put better incident response for computer hacking-type attacks as well as better policies and procedures and training in place and mitigation plans. So, it's a growth budget. We informed, Todd and I, at our last Board meeting, informed [Division of the] Budget, OGS also helps us prepare the budget, and the Executive Chamber, to expect it to be a growth budget as opposed to the budget call letter which set a flat budget. So, as last year...so our budget increases approximately \$15 million to pay for that list of items. Part of that is to try and stabilize the entity of the Board the positions we asked for last year in a side letter that weren't filled for IT and some of the technology and work-related items that we have. It's hard to take on new responsibility when we already have difficulty providing a level of service and 2018 is going to be a very busy year with three elections anyway. And then bigger part of that is there is a portion of security for the state systems, but the largest portion of security are for county boards of elections and we're not sure whether that will end up as money that comes to the state board, aid-to-localities or maybe some other entity but it's what we think is needed to begin to provide a raised level of security of county systems and the state systems.

Douglas Kellner: Okay well thank you. So, we'll go to the Counsels, Brian Quail and Kim Galvin.

Brian Quail: Thank you very much. We'll start with the Counsel Unit. There were a number of significant activities that occurred in important cases, most notably in the Silverberg case where

we received a decision from the federal court that upheld the constitutionality of the “Ballot Selfie Law”, Article 17, §130 subdivision 10, and as of today I do not believe a notice of appeal has been filed in that case.

The Counsels Unit participated also before I move on, its important to recognize that the Attorney General’s Office in all of these cases has represented us and they’ve done an outstanding job and in several of these cases there were multi-unit responses that were needed in a very short period of time involving IT, Operations and the Executive and we received complete cooperation in accomplishing getting together what we needed to pull together. In the Merced case which deals with the constitutionality of our witness provisions related to who can witness an independent nominating petition, we made a motion in that case for summary judgment.

Similarly, in the Eason case, related to the accessibility of our website, we made a motion for summary judgment. We participated with our partners in the Attorney General’s Office in Syracuse in opposing a fee application in the Parish v. Kosinski case related to village nominating petitions, and we also made a motion again through the Attorney General’s Office in the Murawski case which is difficult to describe but basically alleges various aspects of the election process in New York Law are unconstitutional because of apportionment deficiencies, basically it’s a nuisance case, and those efforts occupied a great deal of time and energy on the part of the Counsel’s Unit.

We sent the proposed calendar for 2018 to the Department of Justice. We also shared it with the Attorney General’s Office because the State of New York is a named party and recently having spoken to the folks at the Department of Justice they indicated to us that they were going to be getting back to us imminently and we look forward to that. We understand the exigency of moving that process along so that there’s a political calendar that people can rely upon for the federal primary and federal nominating processes and federal election in 2018.

In the area of Administrative Rules, the amendments to the HAVA administrative complaint procedure that the Board adopted became effective on October 18th. The re-publication of the treasurer resignation regulation occurred, and that item is ready to come back to the board any time after, I believe, November 12th.

Switching now to the Compliance Unit, the Training Unit has scheduled a number of webinars for October and November dealing with how to comply. This follows up on their more than 25 in-person trainings that were conducted earlier this year. Webinar options are available on our website and people can register for those right on the website at any time. There’s only one up there now which relates to one that’s going to be help this Wednesday. The additional offerings will be up imminently. Also in December and January, there will be the “Winding Down the Campaign” webinars also being held by the Training Unit.

Peter Kosinski: Brian....

Brian Quail: Yes?

Peter Kosinski: Are those live webinars that we're doing now?

Brian Quail: Yes.

Peter Kosinski: For Campaign Finance, do we have a stock campaign finance video that a treasurer, potential treasurer can watch?

Brian Quail: We had worked on one of those and I would have to check on the status of it. We have not provided one of those but there was some work that had been done.

Peter Kosinski: It would be helpful to....

Douglas Kellner: Just tape the webinar.

Peter Kosinski: Yes, right...just tape a webinar and just leave it up there so that new treasurers coming in after the webinar would have something to look at to at least give them something to work on as to how to be a treasurer.

Risa Sugarman: A podcast even...so they can listen to....

Peter Kosinski: Whatever format, but it seems like there should be something up there.

Brian Quail: A static.

Peter Kosinski: Yes, right, so I can go on whenever. I can't sign up for the live....

Brian Quail: That makes complete sense. That makes complete sense.

In terms of Compliance Unit activities, let's see we have in total received and processed 85,613 reports, 74,000 reviews had been completed. 14,996 reports contained at least one deficiency, 8,311 received training notices, and 51,037 were compliant. In terms of the status of referred deficiencies there are approximately, I believe, 837 reports that have a deficiency on them outstanding as of today. With respect to failures-to-file for 2017, there were 2,105 nonfiling incidents identified by the Unit initially, and presently 1,371 of those remain outstanding which, as of the September meeting, we had 69% of those nonfilings had not been satisfied. The percentage for the January Periodic has dropped to 65.13%, with respect to the July Periodic there were 1,879 nonfilings which 1,741 or 92.65% remain outstanding. And I think by way of metrics that is the Compliance report.

Douglas Kellner: Could you advise us on the status of the Common Cause Lawsuit?

Brian Quail: Absolutely. Absolutely. It was on my list Commissioner and I apologize for not having brought it up. It was item #2, and I just went over it. The Common Cause Lawsuit that was commenced related to the obligation, or not, to provide the Inactive List at the poll sites. We have with the plaintiff in that case negotiated an extension for the time to either move or to

answer to November 17th and then if we do make a motion, a briefing schedule that will require them to respond by December 22nd and then us to serve reply by the 12th of January. And at this time, we have determined that in light of the Attorney General not representing the agency that we believe that agency Counsel should represent the agency. I apologize Commissioner for leaving that off.

Douglas Kellner: Okay. Anything else for Counsel or Compliance? Then we turn to Election Operations. Tom Connolly.

Tom Connolly: Thank you Commissioner. The Election Operations Unit amongst other things has been working with county boards in their run up to the general election. With regard to Justice of the Supreme Court, we received a total of 24 nominations for a total of 40 candidates, one General and its corresponding Specification -- Specific Objection was received here. Since the last meeting we did prepare and forward to all county boards the general election certification. We did work with PIO on translations of the information for the ballot proposals both for which we sent to the county boards for their use in bringing the ballots and regarding the publishing requirements that we have to do that John spearheads. Also following up on last meeting some of the discussion about usability, we created some sample ballots as some best practices for the county boards which we provided to them. We assisted some of those counties with implementing some of those recommendations. In addition, we also, Brendan and I, had a call with the Center for Civic Design who has done some work in the past in New York. They also actually helped work on the last main revision of the Voter Registration form. We've been talking about different ways in which we can kind of have them talk to us about how best to kind of provide some best practices from a usability standpoint, the county boards for both ballots and any other materials that we think might be applicable. We've done, as with other units in the board, regarding Part 6210.20, the Automated Audit Tool Reg, integrating some of the comments we had received previously. With regard to machines we have been discussing with OGS, the Office of General Services, the contracting process for renewing our testing lab. Our testing lab contract is up in April of 2018, so we've been working with OGS to kind of get the process for the next version of that contract up and running. There are only two certified testing labs in the country so we're just trying to figure some of that stuff out because we also require independent code review whenever there's a change to the voting system. So, one of the vendors is moving to the vendor that we currently use so we might have to kind of, depending if we continue with our existing vendor going forward, trying to figure out ways to ensure that there's an independent review of some of the software code. You had voted on the last meeting the...

Peter Kosinski: Tom, can I stop you right there. So just describe that to me. So, you're saying that there's only two vendors currently testing voting systems?

Tom Connolly: There are currently two EAC-certified vendors, ProV&V (Huntsville, Alabama) and SLI (Wheat Ridge, Colorado).

Peter Kosinski: So, we have a contract with one of those?

Tom Connolly: SLI, yes.

Peter Kosinski: Okay and you're talking about renewing it and your concern is what? That there's got to be a different vendor that looks at changes to systems that have been certified by one vendor?

Tom Connolly: So certain changes; engineering change orders don't require a secondary kind of review, but code, software code changes EMS for example that normally is done by its reviewed by one lab, the code review itself, and then that code review is independently reviewed by a secondary lab or reviewer. In the case of we currently use SLI for a lot of those reviews, ES&S had in the past been using NTS or Wiley Labs, but they have now contracted with SLI so obviously that causes a problem that if they have SLI do a software code review we can't utilize SLI to independently review their own work. So, we have to kind of look at that going forward.

Peter Kosinski: So, what is our option then? What can be done?

Tom Connolly: I believe in the past, I know Bob can speak to it, historically, I believe we've used our contract with NYSTEC to have them find another vendor that could independently verify the work.

Peter Kosinski: But it's a non-certified voting system.

Tom Connolly: So, the certified voting, the certified testing themselves are the ones who must be certified in order to do the code review, the secondary review that we have isn't necessarily by a certified lab but just someone who can review the work that that lab did to make sure they did all the things they said they were supposed to do. So, it doesn't have to be the other lab since there's only two that are involved, it just has to be someone who can actually do the review of the work that was done by one of the certified labs. So, at this point, if, for whatever reason, that other vendor were to get the contract with us, it wouldn't be so much of an issue because, once again, we have two separate vendors. The only issue would be if right now we have a contract with SLI, if they win the next contract then we have a vendor who is using the same vendor that we are. So, we would just figure out, but we've done so in the past, so I think we would be able to do it going forward as well.

Last month the Board approved a new "Statement of Votes Cast" report for Dominion. We had distributed that to the counties that had requested it. We also had both voting machine vendors come in last week to show some new hardware and proposed changes to software. Dominion had come in and shown us their ICE machine which is the Image Cast Evolution. It's kind of combining some of the BMD and the actual ballot scanner itself. ES&S also came in and they had told us about some changes to software and hardware that they were looking at. They still have to bring that before EAC for approval, but they were looking at doing so in the beginning of the next year. Now the only other possible issue that we may run into that we've been talking with OGS about is that our contract with SLI ends April of 2018. So, if we were also to start a certification process with some of the new stuff whether or not that would be able to be completed by the end of that contract it may not be possible. So, the question is, can you hand it off, if SLI were not to continue the contract can you hand it off to a different vendor midstream

or would we have to have one vendor see it through? We would have to work out with OGS what our options are to that.

We also have reviewed a submission for ES&S engineering change order for a new screw assembly which has also been reviewed by SLI. I will provide that paperwork for the Commissioners to look at.

Lastly, some of the things that have already been discussed, regarding security, I attended an EAC cyber security roundtable down in Washington, D.C. a couple of weeks ago and I think that went very well. It was Ben Spear from MS-ISAC, Amber McReynolds from Denver, Colorado with her IT professional, Scott Cardinas, we had Joe Alonzo who is kind of a security expert and it was moderated by the Chairman of the EAC, Matt Masterson. That went well I think. Bill and I also attended a tabletop exercise down in New York City with the FBI. I thought that was very informative. Representatives from the New York City Board of Elections were also there. It was not necessarily surrounding elections, but it was just a tabletop exercise about a cyber threat. So, I think it was kind of interesting. We kind of went through it. They talked about it from the point of what the FBI would be doing throughout the process, what the company might be doing, what their Counsel might recommend they do, what their IT guy would probably recommend at different points in the process. And also, what any vendor that they may hire to kind of remediate the issue from their perspective. So, it was kind of good to get a variety of perspectives on that.

As was mentioned before, I was able to attend the second day of the meetings of the Coordinating Council in Atlanta which Todd has spoken about before. I think that is certainly an ongoing conversation. I know that they are also looking to setting up the Sector Coordinating Council which would be kind of a similar group that involves the vendors of election systems. So that would be something separate and apart just, so they can share information amongst themselves. And then lastly, I attended a symposium last week in Auburn University that was entitled *The Inclusion Integrity Election Administration Symposium*. It did have a lot to do with data, but it also did focus very heavily on a lot of the relevant topics of today including security. There were a number of people who had attended the Coordinating Council Meeting in Atlanta that were then subsequently at the symposium in Auburn.

Lastly, I did want to mention that we have hired a new Secretary, Amy Corman, she started last week and so I'm happy that she started and that she's back. And that's it. Brendan do you have anything else?

Brendan: Just one thing, I know we mentioned it last meeting, but I think it bears repeating that this will be Lisa Shaw's last week of work. So, after 37+ years working for the agency she's going to retire this week. So, we wish her well and wish us well too.

Peter Kosinski: Yes, we wish Lisa well.

Douglas Kellner: Alright so Public Information, John Conklin.

John Conklin: Thank you Commissioner. Public Information Office has been busy since the September meeting, lots of calls, inquiries from the general public and the press on local campaign finance filings, the primary election, statewide ballot props, particularly the constitutional convention question among other things. We did get approval from OGS and the State Comptroller for our purchase order for the legal ads, it was for approximately \$67,000. As mentioned at the last meeting, the Governor signed a new law setting up a requirement for us to publish campaign websites for various candidates on our website. We had a meeting with Counsel, Election Ops and IT to begin the process of determining what we need to do to prepare for that so that's moving forward. We participated in a monthly ECA call in September. The internal cyber security review is ongoing and we're participating in that. We were part of the DHS call that Bob mentioned earlier. The Unit responded to 49 FOIL requests in September. Regarding the website, we posted the certification for the general election ballot. We posted the webcast and the transcript of the September 15th Board Meeting. We made some updates regarding the regulations that are on the website as Brian mentioned. And Greg conducted the annual NVRA training in New York City. Tom do you have anything to add? This is your last meeting to do that.

Douglas Kellner: Okay so Bill Cross.

Bill Cross: Good afternoon Commissioners. I'll start with projects, CAPAS-FIDAS – we continue to try to resource that. We have one outstanding vacancy still. We're having some difficulty filling that one trying to get the skill set we need but we're still working on it and hopeful. As I mentioned last meeting we had two outreach sessions for working groups; one for treasurers and one for county board of elections. The treasurers we provided a demonstration of the system as we have it now our prototype.

Douglas Kellner: How many treasurers participated?

Bill Cross: I don't have the number with me maybe a dozen maybe a little bit more. Mostly WebEx call, I'm not sure the quantity that was actually on the call. We also had a session with the county board of elections. For that one it was more of a discussion in terms of data they collect data we need for our system and how we can exchange it and work in cooperation in doing so. From that we're building some requirements for our system and ultimately how it will work with theirs. Both sessions were very productive. We see positive feedback and we intend to have several more in the future with both working groups. Plus, another, most likely with vendors as well. The development continues on-track including EFS use cases, the political calendar function is significant progress this month, as well as data conversion. John also mentioned our meeting to discuss retrofitting of the publication of the campaign websites both into the existing system and to build some requirements for that functionality to be included in the new system. For NYSVoter we continue working with our contract vendor and made significant progress on the upgrade of our infrastructure. That's going very well. Much of the equipment we have for disaster recovery site data center has now been installed. We've started our primary data site. We're obviously at this point working around filing periods and the upcoming election date is to minimize down time there. So that's slowed that a little bit but we're on track for completion of the calendar year at this point for that. Things are going very

well with minimum problems and minimum down time. For MOVE progress is also being made on the development in-house for the new application it's currently outsourced and we're looking at the beginning of next year for that as well. Significant activity this month in terms of cyber security and the variety of areas covered by that broad title. Many people have already mentioned or covered them particularly Homeland Security call, the FBI exercise, the significant work that went into the pretty comprehensive budget that really enhanced what the state board's current cyber security posture as well as the county boards and being able to provide them some resources as well. As I mentioned we also continued to work with NYSTEC on the risk assessment for the county boards. We collected some additional clarifying information from the initial survey and we'll just await their report right now on that.

Website, I think we have relatively normal levels of activity for this time of year including suspected increase on voter look-up traffic around the primary. That site had about 222,000 views for the month, 93,000 of which were on September 12th. The primary website has a small increase which we usually see ramping up towards the end of the year.

Douglas Kellner: Okay any questions? Then we'll do Enforcement, Risa Sugarman.

Risa Sugarman: Good afternoon Commissioners, I have no report to make to you for this meeting.

Douglas Kellner: Any questions? We'll go to Old Business. I think Tom you gave us a brief report on the status of the Automated Audit Tool regulations. Do you need to add anything at this point?

Tom Connolly: No, I think we continue to circulate that around the agency. We integrated the comments of what we have received and hopefully we'll bring a final draft to you at next meeting.

Douglas Kellner: Okay so we'll put that over to the next meeting. I don't think there's any New Business but there was a personnel item, does it really need to be in executive session? So, we're proposing that Cheryl Couser who has previously worked at the agency in the Campaign Finance Enforcement Unit become the Deputy Director of the Public Information Unit. Those in favor? (Chorus of ayes; 4-0) Opposed? Okay.

And then we have Executive Session for Enforcement but before we do that should we discuss our next meeting date?

Peter Kosinski: I think we should...

Bob Brehm: We need to meet to certify the general election no later than December 15th which is a Friday. We tend to target as close to that date as possible because of the...

Peter Kosinski: Are we going to meet in November?

Douglas Kellner: I don't care.

Peter Kosinski: I don't care either.

Douglas Kellner: It's really just the audit regs would be the only thing if we set a meeting date in November would that happen any faster?

Peter Kosinski: Probably not. Do you want to set it in December then?

Douglas Kellner: Sure.

Peter Kosinski: So, the week of the 11th?

Douglas Kellner: Either the 14th or the 15th.

Gregory Peterson: As I said, I may have to come in video.

Peter Kosinski: Oh, that's right. He has surgery.

(All talking)

Douglas Kellner: Alright so December 15th. Okay so...

Peter Kosinski: If we need a meeting in between you can let us know...

Douglas Kellner: Exactly.

Peter Kosinski: ...and we can arrange something else.

Douglas Kellner: So, motion now is to go into Executive Session for Enforcement matters.

Peter Kosinski: I'll second.

Douglas Kellner: All those in favor say "Aye". (Chorus of ayes; 4-0). Opposed. Adopted unanimously. We'll go into the library and we don't anticipate coming back.