

09:36:37 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:

yes

09:36:43 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:

yes

09:36:46 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

Yup!

09:41:26 From Eileen Newcomer to Hosts and panelists:

Given the first note, it may be helpful to update this page on the WEC website -

<https://elections.wi.gov/poll-workers-observers/election-observers>

The language around observing an election administration event makes it seem like the rules apply to those activities as well. It would be helpful to have outlined which activities follow the open meeting rules only.

10:22:52 From Toya Harrell to Hosts and panelists:

Thank you, Caroline!! I concur wholeheartedly!

10:23:44 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

And i think we will also get to all of this in 4.03

10:28:34 From Toya Harrell to Hosts and panelists:

I feel we're getting way off topic on this subject. if it's a State Statute, we must all abide by it.

10:29:22 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:

I agree with Toya. We need to move on. I think the Commission will have enough info to know there was discussion on this point.

10:29:53 From Robert Newby to Hosts and panelists:

I agree with Toya and Eileen.

10:33:00 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

Agreed. I think this definition is accurate and later we will discuss the process and procedure. from 3 feet, you cannot see these confidential details and it has not been at issue at least in Milwaukee.

10:53:06 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

"Inspect" would mirror the language of 6.45(1m)

10:57:15 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:

I agree that "in real time" is vague.

10:57:19 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:

Please feel free to add comments/thoughts here - they will be captured in the minutes. Thanks.

11:00:59 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:

LWVWI appreciates and supports the definition of "organization" as written in draft document.

11:05:25 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:

Again, primary representation matters, especially when number of observers must be limited due to space. Ie., Can someone change who they say they represent to hold an observer space?

11:06:56 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:

I agree with Ryan regarding priority for candidate representatives getting priority at recounts

11:07:33 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:

I like the language in 4.01 (19)

11:08:22 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:

If you have to be specific, maybe "employed by or volunteering for" an organization would do it. It's one or the other, right?

11:11:07 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

19

11:11:16 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:

19

11:11:18 From Toya Harrell to Hosts and panelists:

19

11:11:24 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:

19

11:11:28 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:

19

11:11:34 From Robert Newby to Hosts and panelists:

19  
11:11:40 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
19  
11:11:44 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
I prefer 19 but think that it should include additional language: "deployed, assigned, trained by, or identify as representing"  
11:11:48 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
19  
11:11:52 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
19  
11:12:13 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
I like David's suggested addition to 19  
11:12:27 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
19 with the language proposed by David Kronig  
11:14:35 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I'd suggest we reference "except for inspection of materials that are confidential." or something similar to that. You can observe someone presenting their ID, but an observer cannot inspect their ID because of the confidential nature.  
11:15:53 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with Claires above point^  
11:16:05 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
Nor should the scanning of incoming ballots into wisvote be required to be done publicly. I think we need to flesh out a lot of what is and is not public and then come back to this.  
11:16:10 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with Clare on added language.  
11:16:22 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with Claire's two above points  
11:16:31 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:  
Received  
11:19:24 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
Claire on this do you mean Ballots? or Ballot Envelopes/ Certificates? I see no problem with observers if available to see the full processing of incoming absentee ballots.  
11:21:07 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
Due to space for sorting and alphabetizing and having computers set up, i do not think it should be required to be observable. These are back office procedures and not every municipality would be able to make these observable without allowing observers into office space. We have prioritized making these at least viewable via window, but that is because our space allows it. I think this will come up when we get to observable practices location specific.  
11:21:22 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
Common Cause also wants to be on record as protecting and centering the right to vote by qualified electors.  
11:21:55 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with Ryan I like 4.02 as written.  
11:22:25 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree 4.02 should be 4.01 should be the priority of our discussions, but leave as written.  
11:23:34 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
I would also propose adding "casting a lawful ballot or registering to vote"  
11:31:33 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
I can't hear Brandon either  
11:32:08 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
Yes we can hear you now  
11:35:06 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I echo David's thoughts for the exact reason he mentions. We would have to rent a convention center for every election, not just generals, with this language.  
11:35:54 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I also agree with a limit to total number. Otherwise, in my experience, a partisan observer signs back in as representing "theirselves"

11:36:07 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with David's and Caroline's comments.

11:36:26 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with Caroline.

11:38:41 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with Yolanda

11:41:04 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I'd suggest we leave it as written but removing "representing the same organization". The word "reasonably" instills a standard in my opinion - it would depend on the entirety of the circumstances.

11:44:11 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:  
What happens when we have so many observers in a small room that they are now closer than 3 ft?

11:44:49 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
Yes - i think that is an excellent suggestion about reporting to both the WEC and the municipal clerk/director. It becomes an accessibility issue if a polling place is being chosen that cannot accommodate at least 3 observers, for example.

11:46:13 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I suggest we add a procedure for if observers need to be limited in any way.

11:46:28 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with Eileen

11:46:35 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
why would a polling place be chosen that can NOT accommodate observers?

11:48:15 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
The Election official should justify limiting observers in a written document that should be written up, shown to the observer and the observer sign off that they were duly notified of the limitations and why the decision was made to limit.

11:50:11 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
I think over all we need a way to hold CI's and/or clerks accountable when they are violating these rules and clearly trying to keep people from observing. Many of the issues have been going on for years and nothing changes.

11:51:17 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I fully agree with Diane and the suggested documentation, including how many observers had to be sent away by having them sign off.

11:51:30 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
Submitting a floor plan to share with observers seems burdensome

11:52:28 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:  
I don't agree with submitting a floor plan.

11:53:48 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
Creating it correctly one time, or modifications as needed is not that burdensome. In Racine and Mt Pleasant we have done this, and they have now complied, for the most part, with the exception of having the observers on the wrong side of the voters and PW's. :^).

11:55:17 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
While we would love to have a floor plan for all 180 polling places and it is a long term goal, the reality is that the floor plan changes on turnout, what room within the building we are placed and having the staff to visit all 180 sites on election day to document such a "floor plan."

11:55:48 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
Could that be on the incident form? Having to start turning away observers would be considered an incident?

11:59:17 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
My thoughts were to put the reason for limitations on the same observer log and floors plans can be are ever changing due to the expected voter turnout, so this would become burdensome.

12:04:58 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
Our 180 chief inspectors all set their own appointments up with building engineers to setup. that would be difficult for us to manage the day before the election. However, I think there needs to be ways for observers to file complaints even if they are not residents of the municipality. I believe that may be the issue right now under the complaint system, but that is not within our purview here.

12:08:48 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
3 observers per ward as a minimum standard seems very reasonable for a standard for polling place

selection in my opinion. I know there is concern about setting forward a number, but that should not be burdensome as a minimum if the polling place is adequate.

12:12:53 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:

I again would just comment that Wis. Stat. 7.41 does not give the chief inspector or municipal clerk the ability to place an arbitrary cap. Only "reasonably limit the number of persons representing the same organization."

12:13:15 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:

I totally disagree with David

12:14:17 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

Ryan, not sure if that was in response to me, but i was suggesting a bare minimum - not a max. But that is a good point.

12:14:47 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:

I want to go on record as being against submitting layout plans ahead of an election. Please excuse me, but I want to be very direct. The Chief and inspectors have taken an oath to serve with the primary goal of providing the most fair and efficient process possible for voters. We set up the day before, in general based on experience, but tweaked for expected turnout. At the polling locations in Mequon, we were mindful of leaving space we for observers, with time to observe. What happened in Racine should not have been allowed to happen, but the election officials need to have the discretion to balance the administration of the election and the voting process with the privileges of observers. The inspectors have taken an oath. The observers have not.

12:17:52 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:

David, can you please provide that text directly here? The language you proposed.

12:18:53 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:

"Designated election officials shall instruct observers that if they were trained or assigned by, affiliated with, or otherwise identify as representing an organization, that they must list that organization in the observer log."

12:19:04 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:

Thank you!

12:21:51 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:

calling the clerk with questions if the observer has questions, would not be a reasonable election day process for observers to ask questions.

12:22:14 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:

^I appreciate Ryan's comment related to that.

12:22:15 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:

I agree with this suggestion that a summary of rules be provided to observers

12:25:16 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:

I think the purpose of this exercise is to address issues for observation. I'm glad that Mequon was able to abide by the needs of all of the participants. What several of us have experienced is hostility from the CI's and the City Clerk. complaints have been filed by myself and others related to these issues. I would argue that the very reason we are engaging in this process is because of the abusive/ hostile behavior of the City Clerk of Racine. She has been sued numerous times on various issues only to be not clearly outlined in the rules/ statutes.

12:28:45 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:

The chat and minutes will be aligned with arguments, etc.

12:28:48 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:

Caitlyn is also asking clarifying questions if needed

12:29:02 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:

Perfect! Thanks!

12:29:09 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:

\*Caitlin - sorry!

12:29:40 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:

I understand where you are coming from and found your experience to be appalling. There's just a wide array of experiences throughout Wisconsin so it's hard to develop legislation that addresses all in a balanced manner. I do appreciate your input and perspective.

12:30:37 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:

Thanks for your input, Eileen. There will also be an opportunity for the members to review the minutes, to make sure everything was captured correctly before heading to the Commission.

12:32:29 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
I think that is covered in the wording one or more areas.

12:35:42 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I also support setting 3 feet as the preferred standard over 8 feet

12:36:48 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
Exactly Ryan! 3 feet should be the preferred distance if it doesn't interfere as clearly stated.

12:36:48 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
Its not clear for observers that a ballot is being remade. I'd prefer that it is announced and the reason why.

12:37:43 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with Karen the remaking of a ballot is exactly what needs to be observed.

12:39:00 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Add to observe the tabulators as well.

12:39:39 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Sorry, I meant Kristin regarding observing remaking of ballots

12:40:14 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
For this process I would suggest 8 ft away so the observer cannot see the markings on the ballots (damaged ballot & remade ballot) because that would breach the voter privacy since the observer may be able to observe the voter name from the absentee envelope.

12:40:42 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
I also agree with Kristin re: the importance of remaking a ballot, as well as the observation areas.

12:41:24 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
The last sentence is fine with me.

12:41:27 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
Strike the last sentence

12:41:34 From Robert Newby to Hosts and panelists:  
Strike the last sentence

12:41:41 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Keep the last sentence

12:41:46 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:  
Strike the last sentence.

12:41:47 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
Keep the last sentence

12:41:51 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
Strike last sentence.

12:41:56 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
Keep

12:41:57 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
keep the last sentence

12:42:12 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
I think observation of remakes is very important. How to alert the observer not to interfere with the process is the question and perhaps that can be outlined in the guidance or rules.

12:42:14 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I think keep it. It still gives the chief the discretion based on the physical limitations and it isn't within 3 feet of the voters necessarily, but the table/election workers.

12:42:57 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:  
Comments received by WEC

12:44:42 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I would add though that this is NOT and should not include tabulators based on how I am reading this section. It would be near impossible to allow an observer within 3 feet of a high speed tabulator at Central Count and still have the election workers function.

12:46:21 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
I believe announcing remaking of the absentee ballot is part of the process outlined in the election admin manual

12:46:21 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Just wanted to write for the record I support the announcement of remaking ballots. They do an excellent job at central counts in Green Bay and Milwaukee, and it alleviates a lot of questions our observers

typically have.

12:46:54 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:

I would suggest "The 3 foot distance described in this paragraph shall be the shortest distance that does not interfere with voting activities..."

12:50:55 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:

I agree with Diane

12:56:53 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

We have a procedure for Central Count workers to also preserve anonymity with remaking ballots, too. I will defer to Diane on the polling place practice, but this is not an issue for us at Central Count and we don't find announcing remakes or rejections burdensome.

12:58:32 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:

Procedure To remake a ballot, the following steps should be followed: 1. At least two election inspectors (if party-affiliated inspectors are present, use one of each party) must participate in this process. 2. Election inspectors shall announce to observers, if present, that a ballot is being remade and the reason for doing so. 3. Note and select a reason for remaking the ballot in the endorsement section of the ballot.

pg 103 of the Election Day Manual

13:04:48 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:

Just want to clarify: if proper procedure is followed, there is no violation of a secret ballot. There should be nothing identifying the voter and their ballot after it is separated from the envelope. Therefore, there should be no issue announcing the remake.

13:08:18 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:

5.85(3) establishes 2 major parties have to remake a ballot. That should be clear to observers that is the case no matter if it is 3 feet or 8 feet away.

13:35:12 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:

Correct 4th line of 5 from "observes" to "observer"

13:36:13 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:

Disagree, should not be included

13:36:58 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:

I do not agree with putting observers behind election inspectors.

13:38:39 From Toya Harrell to Hosts and panelists:

I agree with David.

13:38:44 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:

I think Chief Inspectors can use their discretion while making sure they meet the 3-8 ft rule.

13:38:55 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:

Additionally, putting observers behind or to the side of the check in table would keep them out of the way of voters.

13:39:21 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

I will defer to those that use BadgerBooks, but can't you use the same badgerbook to register and check-in voters? How would you move the registration screen away if someone was suddenly registering? Are there any privacy screens for badger books?

13:40:21 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:

I think there needs to be flexibility because of the wide variety of layouts of polling places, so there should not be a requirement that observers be "behind" the tables. In some places being next to the table is the only option.

13:40:22 From Toya Harrell to Hosts and panelists:

if I'm reading your question correctly, Claire, we use Badger Books for EDR's and check-ins.

13:40:43 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:

Yes, you use the same BadgerBook for registering and checking in.

13:40:47 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:

I like section 4.03 (5) as an option for election officials. I've observed in polling locations where the CI specifically placed me behind the election inspectors and others where they placed me behind the voters.

13:40:56 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:

We do reconcile our BadgerBooks.

13:41:04 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

Toya, what is your opinion on this? Would you be exposing confidential info during registration if someone is behind the poll workers? I don't fully understand the issue here.

13:41:05 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:

Absolutely Observers should be BEHIND the election Workers. 3-8 feet. This process has been used for decades.

13:42:14 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:

Julie Seegers comments at 1:40 I agree with completely.

13:42:55 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:

Behind is not always feasible, so suggested language - remove the wording behind the election inspectors and insert an area within the 3" - 8" requirement.

13:43:14 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:

Where does it say that observers should be placed behind election inspectors? My prior municipality, there's no way that would have worked, the town hall was too small. Also, just because something has been in place for decades doesn't mean it's right or the only way.

13:45:25 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:

Claire I am 95% certain that the registration table is separate from the already registered check in

13:45:55 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:

some municipalities use badger books to check in and do same day registration on the same point

13:46:14 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

I think because you could do either and have the right to do either, this rule does not make sense.

13:46:15 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:

Agree with section (5)

13:46:30 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:

I have been at several places where voting registration was done with the same books at the same lines. That was part of the point of the books.

13:46:46 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:

E-books, I mean.

13:46:51 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

Agreed Kristin. That is how it was sold to clerks!

13:48:26 From Robert Newby to Hosts and panelists:

4.03 (5) Disagree. Reasons to have observer areas in front but not in back of inspector work tables:

No matter what efforts burdensome efforts might made if this were required, it will not be possible in some polling places.

Chief inspectors may have materials on other nearby tables, potentially compromising confidential information and material security located there.

If inspector needs to repeat name/address, hearing will be better in front of table.

Wishes to see items such as photos are weak 3 feet from back of table, as pointed out for reading by some of the committee members advocating for observation in back of table.

Wishes to see photos do not lead to a legal reason to challenge an individual voter.

Potential intimidation of voters.

Potential compromise of confidential information.

13:48:29 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:

There is even a separate position at the polling location - ERO, Election Registration Official

13:48:31 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:

The use of E-books also eliminates the need for separate lines for wards. So one person registering does not hold up the line - the voters continue using the other books.

13:49:47 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:

I agree with Ryan's comment about the need to make the observing area accessible for people with mobility devices.

13:49:56 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:

There should be no front or behind...observers should be able to roam.

13:50:37 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:

checking in and checking out with CI would be burdensome to chief

13:51:03 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with Lana

13:51:03 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I oppose 7 and support 8.

13:51:23 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with 4.03(7) & (8) as written. (8) alone I think would suffice.

13:51:24 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
I oppose 7 and support 8 as well

13:51:38 From Robert Newby to Hosts and panelists:  
I oppose 7 and support 8

13:51:50 From Caroline Fochs to Hosts and panelists:  
i oppose 7 and support 8

13:51:55 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
I support (8).

13:52:01 From Toya Harrell to Hosts and panelists:  
Appose

13:52:17 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
Specifically oppose "without restriction" in #7

13:52:25 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree mostly With #7.

13:52:25 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
I support 7 and oppose 8

13:52:30 From Toya Harrell to Hosts and panelists:  
Appose 7; support 8

13:53:19 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
That is not how I read #7 with the words "without restriction." I would support #7 if those two words were struck.

13:53:22 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
I support item 7 as written. Most election areas are a single room with 3-4 stations. New Registration, Voter check in, Ballot pick up and the voting tabulator. Quitey moving between these different areas would not be a distraction to voters. or the Inspectors.

13:53:28 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
There's too much going on, on Election Day for an observer to have to check in with the Chief before moving from one place to another. I think as long as they're moving between observation areas and moving promptly between locations then it is fine. Agree with 7

13:53:48 From Caroline Fochs to Hosts and panelists:  
We do not physically block off an area for observers with tape or some other way. How would we manage this?

13:54:25 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
7. Movement is distracting. Would ask that any movement not interfere with the voting process or obstruct the line of site for election officials.

13:54:27 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
Caroline. We use a blue tape line of 3 feet, behind each of the election stations.

13:54:46 From Sean Dwyer to Hosts and panelists:  
I support 8 as written.

13:55:00 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
I support 7 - CI always has authority to handle any disruptions

13:55:02 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
I have not heard of any observers obstructing or being tossed out because of roaming. If you have, please let me know that it is truly a problem.

13:55:02 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:  
David, is your agreement with Caroline in regards to 4.03 (6)?

13:55:26 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 7. Have to be able to move between areas to observe different procedures.

13:55:27 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:  
I oppose 7



13:56:14 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Fine with (9). Strongly support (10)

13:57:07 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
Caitlin, yes, in that I think the concern she raised was also relevant to the discussion of section 7

13:57:52 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:  
Right. Thanks!

13:57:53 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
Like this addition. I would be nice to also allow observers to bring in their own chairs. I know some of our observers would bring in their own folding chairs if allowed.

13:58:35 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
Fully support #11 but suggest "unused chairs available within the observable location so long as it does not impede voting operations"

14:00:41 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
good point on restroom access, David.

14:00:47 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
maybe "available chairs" rather than unused?

14:01:17 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with Eileen about "available chairs"

14:01:22 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
Yes, just say chairs must be available. Even a couple. Observers are not going to drag chairs around with them.

14:01:41 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
Its not clear in how its currently written that it allows people to bring their own chairs. If that could be clarified that would be great.

14:03:26 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
access to bathrooms should not be unreasonably restricted.

14:03:53 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
I know for a fact that one of the observers Ken is speaking about has a urine bag and was denied access restrooms.

14:05:07 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree, Ken!

14:05:47 From Toya Harrell to Hosts and panelists:  
We have chairs set up and never deny restroom access to our Observers.

14:06:14 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
11 Propose scratching "any unused" and "available" so it reads access to chairs within... Restroom access should be same as election officials.

14:06:34 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
Some polling places are at park pavilions. They may not have bathrooms

14:07:00 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 12

14:07:02 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
In favor of the documentation

14:07:21 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 12

14:07:22 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
I also agree with 12 as drafted

14:08:11 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 12

14:08:47 From Sean Dwyer to Hosts and panelists:  
I support 12

14:09:04 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
ok with 12. Note for the chat: Red is Kristin Hanson. Orange is Karen Huffman

14:09:39 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
Why duplicate reporting. If observers cannot be accommodated, the CI should note that on the Observer Log that is used for observers to sign in and the reasons why it could not be accommodated.

14:10:30 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Scratch 9

14:10:39 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
agree with 13

14:10:44 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 13.

14:11:08 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
also agree with 13

14:11:11 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
& David's comment on announcement

14:11:50 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
maybe also add a note to make it known the reason why an absentee ballot certificate envelope was rejected

14:12:16 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with Eileen's additional suggestion

14:12:44 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:  
Thanks Karen H.

14:14:14 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
as a general practice, use statutory language whenever possible.

14:14:49 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I believe there is a strong concern of disruption or voter intimidation with the photography and videography in a polling place

14:15:21 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Strongly agree with (15)

14:15:24 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
...as written

14:15:45 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree. But obviously they'll need to be able to sign in an that could include touching the paper.

14:15:59 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
^agreed to 16

14:18:49 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with David's comments for observer removal.

14:19:03 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with (17) as written.

14:20:08 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree the offense shall be in writing and immediately. Paper trail created and the observer has easy access to legal council as needed.

14:21:13 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with David that an official designated by the chief inspector or municipal clerk to serve in their absence be required to observe the same rules as the chief inspector or municipal clerk in the event an observer needs to be removed.

14:23:03 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
In reality, if someone is causing a disturbance in the polling place, keeping them present long enough to then receive a form that has to be written in duplicate does not seem realistic. However, getting the observer's address (from sign in sheet or otherwise) or email and sending them a copy within 24 hours seems more reasonable.

14:23:48 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:  
A situation with an observer would be noted on the incident report. If it's a quick situation that the observer needs to leave in that moment, the paperwork isn't feasible. We could follow up though after the election.

14:24:38 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
For some reason I'm getting some direct chats that are meant for the general record. People may want to go through their chats and make sure they were sent to everyone.

14:24:55 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
EL 4.04 (16) add language: "...shall not permit observers to observe any confidential information, while also allowing observers to observe all the public aspects of the voting process"

14:25:27 From Anita Johnson to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with Dave for observer removal.

14:25:44 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:

#18 - again duplicative. The CI must write up an incident for everything that happens at the poll and if someone is removed, an incident must be written up. A copy of that log could be sent to the Commission.

14:26:21 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with (18) as written.

14:26:32 From Eileen Newcomer, LWVWI to Hosts and panelists:  
I need to jump off. Thank you for this opportunity. I look forward to the notes. Brandon I will follow up with you about the portions of the conversation that I will miss.

14:26:35 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
I am uncomfortable with the "opposite party" part of 17, because that requires people to identify themselves as members of a party. I can imagine the CI saying out loud "I need a Democrat" or "I need a Republican" when poll workers should be seen as neutral by voters.

14:26:43 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 18

14:28:23 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 18. We issue the official order to leave form with the details and then have Chief's write a reference to that accompanying form, the time, and the observer who was ordered to leave on the 104.

14:29:30 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
The CI knows who the party affiliated workers are and we have opposing parties sign bags, tapes and other forms throughout the day without yelling out "I need a Democrat" lol.

14:36:35 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Kristen, what is that organization and phone number?

14:36:58 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Thank you!!

14:37:04 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
1866ourvote

14:42:29 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
4.04 1. I think it's good to know when the observers sign in and out as it helps to know what they observed and when. Also helps to know when they leave if they haven't informed the chief.

14:42:59 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Good catch by David - would prefer just removing the citation for the ID requirement

14:43:14 From Katie Reinbold to Hosts and panelists:  
Thank you for this opportunity. I need to jump off and will email my comments.

14:43:24 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
4.04(1) observer should acknowledge receiving a written copy of the rules. (2) ...following a warning

14:44:03 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Prefer to keep (11) as-is

14:44:39 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I do as well on #11. Otherwise there is no quality control for answers.

14:45:13 From Robert Newby to Hosts and panelists:  
I support David's suggestions for 11.

14:46:43 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:  
I think #10 should be struck and location specific

14:52:29 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
I do not agree with 4.04(1) that the observer must sign out. CI's are very busy and there is no purpose for the sign out from administering the election perspective. Remove address from log as well.

14:53:16 From Caroline Fochs to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree with Karen Huffman regarding observers logging in and logging out

14:53:20 From Anita Johnson to Hosts and panelists:  
I don't think that Id and address should be required by the observers. Signing in and out should be sufficient.

14:53:20 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
Provided that out of state licenses be permitted, as has been standard practice, I support maintaining the requirement that observers show photo ID to sign in. It hasn't been burdensome in our experience, and I think it's important to verify who is there in the event that they become disruptive at any point.

14:53:26 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
No need for street address and photo ID for observers.

14:53:27 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:

I don't think observers should sign in and out - no time for CI's to monitor every time they come in and out. Agree with just a box saying if they are Wisconsin resident so that we know if they can challenge.

14:53:57 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:

Agree with Lana

14:53:58 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

I also agree about signing in and out. I do not think it is burdensome and perhaps you don't make it a requirement, but an optional addition for chiefs to use? It would be nice to have in our case.

14:54:50 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:

Include Recourse in this section too

14:54:58 From Claire Woodall-Vogg to Hosts and panelists:

I have to run unfortunately due to another meeting, but will send in my feedback after the meeting.

Lots of opinions on what remains! :)

14:55:03 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:

I like the last sentence of EL 4.04 (11)

14:55:45 From Anita Johnson to Hosts and panelists:

I also have another meeting and have to run. Thanks for the opportunity today.

14:56:07 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:

EL 405 (1). I support B

14:57:01 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:

I support 4.05 (1) B

14:57:18 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:

405(1) (b) ...including the zeroing of the voting machines, observe the floor plan.

14:57:43 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:

Support B with the above exception

14:58:31 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:

Support b. our doors to the poll are open as soon as the CI gets there, typically 6-6:15 am. We do not restrict people from coming in.

14:59:00 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:

Support (b)

14:59:24 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:

I support 4.05(1)(a) over (b)

14:59:25 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:

No statute to support 4.05 (d). Should be able to take any kind of recordings before and after the polls close

14:59:34 From Robert Newby to Hosts and panelists:

Support a

14:59:52 From Caroline Fochs to Hosts and panelists:

I am in favor of 4.05(1)(a) with language allowing them in prior to 7:00. (b) is not workable as we set up our polling sites the day before.

15:00:26 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:

4.05 1 Prefer a with language to include observation of the zeroed out machine immediately prior to first vote.

15:01:20 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:

405 1 c If there are multiple observers per ward, could end up with more observers than site can hold.

Eliminate c

15:01:56 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:

405 1 d Agree with David ...add "the interior of" in front of the observable location

15:02:52 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:

I prefer EL 4.05 (1) b. - both for the zeroing of voting machines and possibly, hopefully, to address minor, potential floor plan issues.

15:04:27 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:

I prefer EL 4.05 (2) a.

15:04:54 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:

Support 2(a), (c), (d) (e) restate as "observers shall be permitted to observe at all alternate absentee ballot sites."

15:05:41 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:

Support 4.05(2) a.

15:06:11 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
Support 4.05 (2) a

15:06:19 From Caroline Fochs to Hosts and panelists:  
I am in support of 4.05(2)a.

15:06:30 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
That is not true about UW Madison

15:06:52 From Toya Harrell to Hosts and panelists:  
Never heard of that

15:07:27 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Observers need to be able to follow the chain of custody every step of the way.

15:07:44 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
405. 2. Prefer a over b. c designating the number of observers may be problematic for space management in some city clerk offices. d. Eliminate.

15:09:33 From Robert Newby to Hosts and panelists:  
eliminate (2) d

15:10:15 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Strongly agree with (b), but would like the ability to observe the set up as well.

15:10:34 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
Support 4.05(3) d. - do not support e.

15:11:42 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
I made a mistake. I support (3)(a) because it does include the set up

15:11:43 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Support 4.05(3)(a), (c), (e)

15:12:14 From Sean Dwyer to Hosts and panelists:  
I do believe selection e could be eliminated

15:12:15 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
Support 4.05(3) b. and c.

15:12:19 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Also support 4.05 (3)(c) and (e)

15:12:33 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
I support 4.05 (3) (a), (C) and (E)

15:12:37 From Robert Newby to Hosts and panelists:  
support (3) b over a, delete c, support d over e

15:12:45 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
405. 3 Support b over a, again allowing zeroed out machine immediately prior to first vote, and d over e.

15:13:04 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
Absentee Ballot Canvas at either Central Count or Canvass I support e. Allow video

15:13:57 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
I prefer EL 4.05 (3) a. and e.

15:14:05 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
I support the entirety of absentee voting in residential care facilities as drafted here

15:14:44 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
Common Cause does not support allowing observers into people's private rooms at care facilities.

15:15:06 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
p.13 of WEC manual: "There may be instances when voting occurs in a resident's room. If space permits, observers are allowed inside the resident's room, and in an observation area from 3 to 8 feet where the voting occurs, as determined by the SVDs. If space constraints prevent accommodating an observation area within that distance, the special voting deputies shall document the actual location of the observation area and the reasons why it could not be located within the 3 to 8 feet distance."

15:15:30 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Would support that ^

15:16:01 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
The Libertarian Party supports observers access to all voting location process as permitted by space available.

15:16:04 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 405.4 Voting for Residential Care facilities proposed legislation as written.

15:17:27 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
We follow the WEC Care Facility manual as written and make every effort to accommodate observers. This section should mirror the manual.

15:17:34 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with (4)(a) because it is a statute. Agree with (b)

15:18:02 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
Are observers allowed to observe the registration of residential care facility's residents?

15:19:29 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with p. 13 of WEC manual as referenced by Ryan and (4)

15:19:52 From Caroline Fochs to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 405.4 Voting for Residential Care facilities proposed legislation as written with one exception. (f) should add at the end of the sentence or private rooms while the voter is voting.

15:20:36 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with Central count(6)(d).

15:21:05 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
I do not support c. for Central Count because of remakes, unless they are segregated. I have no frame of reference for Central Count and would defer to others with experience.

15:21:14 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with Central Count (6) D as well

15:21:38 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
No voters present. No statute to support or not support it.

15:22:02 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
I made a mistake - I do not support d. because of remakes.

15:22:22 From Sean Dwyer to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with Central Count {6} D as well.

15:22:26 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with (6)d with the clarification so long as It is not disruptive as determined by the municipal clerk

15:22:59 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 6D

15:24:20 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with Ken about being able to film in CC

15:24:47 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Fine with 4.06(1)

15:25:15 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 4.06(1) as drafted

15:26:01 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with 4.06 (1) as drafted.

15:26:12 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
405 5 & 6 Agree with David's comments regarding providing preference to candidates and their representation if there are space limitations. Also would eliminate d. against creation and transmission of photos, videos and audio.

15:26:31 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
4.06 Not covered by any statutes

15:27:09 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:  
Received by WEC, thank you for the comments

15:33:05 From Sean Dwyer to Hosts and panelists:  
Don't believe the section prohibits observers

15:33:16 From Kristin Hansen, Common Cause to Hosts and panelists:  
Not all observers are trained properly. Proper media should be treated differently, in my opinion.

15:34:03 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
Not all media personnel are trained properly.

15:35:41 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with Caroline re: confidential listings

15:40:31 From Sean Dwyer to Hosts and panelists:  
Disagree, the media has been covering elections for decades. And in most instances does not disrupt the outcome of elections.

15:40:47 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Again - agree with the need for credentialing

15:41:13 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
4.06 Very conflicted about media credentials. Should be known, pre-approved entities taking into consideration disruption to the process. Social media, in particular, and certain news outlets can do more damage than harm. If this will be on the books for the next 10-20 years, we need to think carefully about the wording and access. I think voters should expect the greatest amount of privacy afforded them in each polling place and for each method of voting (in person v absentee).

15:41:31 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
I meant damage than good.

15:41:33 From David Kronig to Hosts and panelists:  
I can't hear him

15:41:43 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
can't hear Sean

15:42:01 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
I disagree. Having the media there will exacerbate any situation. There is plenty of news to be had outside of the Polling places.

15:42:41 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
The media could just as easily take pictures of all the voters too.

15:42:57 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
And could be used for nefarious reasons.

15:45:27 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
Good points Bill - thank you!

15:46:02 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
What statute allows the media to be there? Should also cover observers.

15:46:55 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
If the media can roam around the polling place, why can't observers who have been trained?

15:47:37 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
I would say that: if observers at recounts are not addressed, then the media should not be covered by this rule either. Expands the scope of the rule under Wis. Stat. 7.41. I would say rules should apply across the board as "members of the public"

15:48:29 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Exactly, Debbie...Rules like free range of the media without statutes should not happen.

15:52:41 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Agree with Diane 100%! More training is certainly needed.

15:53:25 From Caroline Fochs to Hosts and panelists:  
I agree, observers should have mandatory training. I as the Clerk would be willing to do the training.

15:53:54 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
We do train our observers.

15:54:51 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
Thank you to the WEC staff & team!

15:54:58 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
There hasn't been one complaint in the last couple of years on any of our Republican observers.

15:55:08 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
Well said, Diane. Observers are an important part of the process, but training is not consistent across all organizations. Thank you to those who participated today.

15:55:16 From Robert Newby to Hosts and panelists:  
Thank you Brandon for conducting.

15:55:18 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Because they are well trained.

15:55:23 From Diane Coenen to Hosts and panelists:  
I meant more training of clerks/clerks staff/pollworkers/CI by WEC and procedures for best practices being developed. Signing off - thank you Brandon and everyone for your valuable input.

15:55:53 From Ryan Retza to Hosts and panelists:  
I was agreeing with Diane on more training for clerks/inspectors. Certainly important!

15:56:01 From Caroline Fochs to Hosts and panelists:  
Thank you everyone!

15:56:10 From Julie Seegers to Hosts and panelists:  
Thank you Brandon and everyone!

15:56:25 From Lana Lee Helm to Hosts and panelists:  
Thank you Brandon and everyone!

15:56:29 From Karen Huffman to Hosts and panelists:  
Thank you for the honor of participating in this process!

15:56:40 From Ken Brown to Hosts and panelists:  
Mandatory Training I would NOT support. Its already somewhat intimidating to get people to begin the process of participation in the processes in the future.

15:57:10 From Toya Harrell to Hosts and panelists:  
Thank you, Brandon!

15:57:30 From Caitlin Jeidy to Hosts and panelists:  
Thanks, everyone!

15:57:37 From Debbie Morin to Hosts and panelists:  
ditto!

15:57:37 From Sean Dwyer to Hosts and panelists:  
Thank You Brandon