AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION

1

CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS, STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION

----- X

December 4, 2024 Start: 1:09 p.m. Recess: 4:43 p.m.

HELD AT: COMMITTEE ROOM - CITY HALL

B E F O R E: Lincoln Restler, Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Gale A. Brewer
David M. Carr
James F. Gennaro
Shahana Hanif
Vickie Paladino
Lynn C. Schulman
Inna Vernikov

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS ATTENDING:
Julie Menin

AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION

APPEARANCES

Michael Ryan, Executive Director of the New York City Board of Elections

Paul Ryan, Executive Director of the New York City Campaign Finance Board

Susan Lerner, Executive Director Common Cause NY

Marina Pino, attorney at the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law

Ben Weinberg, Director of Public Policy, Citizens Union

Janine Guzzon, Senior Development Manager at the Crime Victims Treatment Center

Orlando Ovalles, Northeast Director of Civic Engagement with NALEO Educational Fund

Claire Stottlemyre, Legal Aid Society and member of the Vote in New York City Jails Coalition

Raquel Bates, Executive Director of the Voices of Women Organizing Project

Kathleen Collins, Co-Coordinator at Downstate New York ADAPT and member of the Greater New York Council of the Blind

the Committee Room.

25

2.2

2.3

Please do not approach the dais at any time. If you do have any questions, please raise your hand, and one of the Sergeant-at-Arms will kindly assist you.

Thank you very much for your kind cooperation.

Chair, we are ready to begin.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: [GAVEL] Good

afternoon. My name is Lincoln Restler, and I am the

Chair of the Committee on Governmental Operations,

State and Federal Legislation. I'd like to welcome my

Colleagues who have joined us today, Council Member

Gale Brewer, Council Member Julie Menin, and Council

Member Lynn Schulman. Thank you for being here.

Today, we are holding an oversight
hearing on the New York City Board of Elections and
Campaign Finance Board's preparations for the June
2025 elections. 2025 is a pivotal election for the
future of New York City. The nation is swearing in a
{resident who traffics in disinformation about
federal election interference and, for the first time
ever, our city is under the leadership of an indicted
Mayor, and voters will likely be determining his
successor, and the Members of the City Council will

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

indeed be electing a new Speaker. There is less confidence today in our electoral process and the integrity of our institutions than perhaps ever before. It's critical that the Board of Elections and Campaign Finance Board are ready and resourced to safeguard democracy and ensure fair and efficient elections in 2025. All eyes are on the Campaign Finance Board's imminent determination of disbursement of public matching funds for 2025 campaigns. New York City has been a national leader in campaign finance reform for decades, and the reputation and credibility of our Campaign Finance Board is very much at stake with this decision. I hope that today we will fully unpack the legal authority of the CFB to withhold millions of taxpayer dollars to a campaign that is apparently rife with corruption.

I am pleased that early voting was a resounding success this past November. Early voting turnout was up. Over one million New Yorkers indeed voted early, more than ever before. Energy was high at Borough Hall, where I voted early with my wife.

During the nine days of early voting at this location in Brooklyn Heights, there were steady lines out the

door, there were warm and helpful staff, and everybody in the room cheered when first-time voters made it to a desk to vote.

While it was a great voting experience for my family, that wasn't true for all. There were isolated incidents of long wait times and some scanning issues, particularly in Queens. These are issues that can sow confusion and undermine confidence in our voting system. We want to make sure that we understand what went wrong and that the BOE has plans in place to prevent future incidents.

Forty years ago, New York City regularly saw 80 percent turnout for presidential elections and 50 to 60 percent turnout for mayoral elections.

Turnout for the November Presidential election was 59 percent. Turnout for the last competitive Mayoral election in June of 2021 was 27 percent for the primary and 23 percent in November for the general.

That is abysmal. Abysmal. While we are making steady progress in registering new voters, we are failing to get more New Yorkers to the polls. I'm keen to hear from the CFB and the BOE on how we can increase voter turnout in New York City this coming June.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

I hope we can use the time today to ensure New York City is preparing to be a model in election operations for how to do things ethically, efficiently, and effectively.

We also will be hearing several pieces of legislation, including a prohibition of AI-generated content preceding elections, sponsored by Council Member Menin, increasing voter registration of young adults, sponsored by Council Member Stevens, privacy protections for voters who are survivors of domestic violence, sponsored by Council Member Brewer, and more.

With that, I'd like to thank the

Governmental Operations Staff, our Committee Counsel,

Jayasri Ganapathy and Erica Cohen, for their hard

work in preparing for this hearing. I'd like to thank

my Communications Director, Nieve Mooney, for doing a

stellar job as always, and I'd especially like to

thank my Chief-of-Staff, Molly Haley, who is the

brains behind this operation.

I will now turn it over to my Colleagues to give opening remarks on their bills. We'll start with Council Member Brewer, the prime sponsor of Intro. 565, which would amend the Charter to provide

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

survivors of domestic violence with guidance onmaking their voter registration records confidential.

Thank you so much, and now to Council Member Brewer.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you very much. I want to particularly thank Cynthia Hornig from my office and others who work in this field for thinking that there are examples, perhaps of many people who are supposed to be not visible to their accuser, somebody who is obviously harassing them and has brought them to a safe place, mostly sponsored by Safe Horizon or other non-profits where they will not be tormented and perhaps killed by whoever is tormenting them, and there are state legislations that have passed, but it has not completed the issue of voting, and so this particular piece of legislation fills a gap and hopefully will pass, and then people hopefully will be able to vote. It's an example of, I think, a community and population that's not often thought of, and I really want to thank everybody, particularly Cynthia Hornig, who made sure that this population is not forgotten when we're voting. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you so much,
Council Member Brewer, a former Chair of this

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

distinguished Committee. I'll now pass it over to Council Member Lynn Schulman, who is the prime sponsor of Intro. 1111, which would adjust the CFP contribution and expenditure limits to account for two-year Council terms, smart piece of legislation from Council Member Schulman.

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Thank you very much, Chair. When the City Council first passed the Campaign Finance Act, the provision that capped expenditures for Council and Citywide offices called for the cap to be increased every four years based on the Consumer Price Index. The four-year figure came from the fact that Citywide and Council offices have four-year terms as a general rule. However, the Law did not account for an anomaly that occurs every 20 years in which Members of the Council serve two twoyear terms because of redistricting of Council lines as a result of the U.S. Census. To rectify this issue and bring equity to Council elections that occur within this rare circumstance, Intro. 1111 changes the frequency with which the Campaign Finance Board recalculates contribution and expenditure limits to account for changes in the Consumer Price Index from once every four years to once every local general

2.2

2.3

election. I look forward to passing this legislation

soon and want to thank Chair Restler for hearing this

bill and for his support of these efforts to bring

5 equity to City Council elections. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you so much.

Now, I would like to introduce Council Member Julie

Menin, the prime sponsor of Intro. 293, which would

prohibit the dissemination of materially deceptive

audio or visual media, AI-generated content in local

elections. Thanks so much, Council Member Menin.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENIN: Thank you so much,

Chair Restler, for holding today's important hearing.

The last election cycle highlighted the increased usage of artificial intelligence used for misinformation. This past January, for example, an AI-generated robocall of President Biden falsely told New Hampshire voters not to vote in the Democratic primary and to wait to vote until November, and just last January, here in New York City, for a local State Assembly race, there was an AI-generated audio of a former Assembly Member bashing an incumbent Assembly Member, which was done to misinform voters.

It is very clear that AI-generated misinformation will not be going away anytime soon. These tools are

not cost-prohibitive and can easily be obtained. In fact, they are rapidly being improved so that it is difficult to distinguish them from an actual person. It is far too easy to anonymously use and abuse these tools to mislead voters. Voters deserve to know what is false. Otherwise, it only serves to worsen our democratic institutions. That is why I introduced Intro. 293, a bill that prohibits the dissemination of materially deceptive audio or visual media in local elections. This would cover any primary, special, or general election for Mayor, Public Advocate, Controller, Borough President, or City Council. Failure to comply would result in a misdemeanor with a fine of no more than 2,500 as well as serious injunctive relief. We have an opportunity to be proactive in addressing a grave threat to our democracy. We cannot wait to regulate until a serious incident occurs. Misinformation is already a global phenomenon, and an election should not be determined by doctored images or audio. We need to ensure safeguards to our democracy. I want to thank the Chair for allowing me to speak, and I want to thank the bill drafter, Jayasri Ganapathy, and I also want

24

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: I do.

25

2 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Yes.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL GANAPATHY: Thank you.

You can go ahead.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Whoever would like to go first. We'll try to hold testimony to about five minutes if that works, but go ahead.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Yes, he actually said that. So, good afternoon, Chair Restler and Members of New York City Council's Committee on Governmental Operations, State and Federal Legislation. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you on behalf of the Board of Elections. I am Michael Ryan. I'm the Executive Director of the Board. Our Deputy Executive Director, Vincent Ignizio, unfortunately could not be here today. Joining me in the audience are our Operations Manager, Georgea Kontzamanis, our Administrative Manager, Michael Corbett, and Deputy General Counsel, Raphael Savino.

I have prepared testimony in accordance with this hearing today, and copies are being, if they have not already been, distributed to the Committee Members. It is not particularly lengthy, but if it is the Committee's preference, I am

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

prepared to dispense with the reading of the

testimony. I would give some highlights and then move

forward to questions, or if you prefer me to go

through the testimony itself, I can do that as well.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I'm happy for you to do highlights if you prefer.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RYAN: Sure. So, with respect to this Presidential election, if you reference page five of the testimony, and excuse the large font, but it's necessary for me to be able to effectively get through it, I did a comparison of the turnout for the Presidential election in 2024 versus 2020. What you would note, I think most notably, is that we actually have had a decrease of approximately 200,000 voters in the City of New York so, yes, the aggregate turnout is lower, but the aggregate number of eligible voters is also lower, and the turnout is a little bit lower from 62 down to 59 so we had comparable turnout. We did see that there was a robust turnout in early voting. We weren't tracking early voting versus Election Day scanner numbers in 2020. We are now so those numbers were readily available. Almost 1.1 million voters voted during early voting. But the thing that I would really want

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

to point out, because I think, if we can run the risk of patting ourselves on the back, I think this year is proof of concept for what we had said from the inception of early voting. In 2019, early voting was established by law. We opened 61 sites, to some criticism at the time that we weren't doing enough.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Right.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: And we said it was important to lay a foundation, that we needed to get it off the ground, and make sure that it would ultimately work properly. Since that time, in the successive years, we went from 61 sites, to 88 sites, to 106 sites, to two years in a row of 140 sites, and this year, we had 155 sites. Now, we're not certain that that's the absolute sweet spot, but we certainly know it's a lot better than, 155 sites is a lot better than 61 sites, and we will continue our efforts in determining whether or not we need more sites, and where we need those sites. But certainly, I will say, and I will share Chair Restler's observations, your observations at your poll site during early voting are not unique. We have found, in our time out in the field on election days, that for whatever reason, voters and poll workers are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

in a much better mood during early voting. I don't know if it's, I can't put a finger on exactly what it is. I think it's that they're picking a time of their own choosing to go vote, and that they are making an investment in time at a moment when it's convenient to the voter and I think that's a great thing. We would also like to point out that not only, and for size reasons, you would say that New York City should have the most number of early voting locations, but the fact of the matter is, we do have the most number of early voting locations in the entire state, but we also had the most number of voting hours. We were trying to come up with some formulaic way of approaching how do you establish early voting hours in the early stages of it and, for this election, for the Presidential election, we tried a different way, and we said, okay, Monday to Friday, we're going to do 8 in the morning to 8 at night, very predictable, very square box around the hours, and then for weekends, we did 8 in the morning to 5, and that seemed to work out well. But you absolutely hit the nail on the head, Chair, when you say that advanced voting during the early voting period certainly takes a lot of pressure off of election day. We tried to

1 2 press during our pre-election preparation and notices 3 to the, what should I say, public education period to 4 impress that absentee balloting and early mail balloting was also an option. We did see a 5 significant drop-off of what I'll call paper 6 7 participation from 2020. There was over 700,000. 8 There was less than 400,000 this election cycle, and we did a robust campaign, spent about 1.5 million dollars to do that, which was an education regarding 10 11 early mail balloting, absentee balloting, and early 12 voting. For whatever reason, I do see that we perhaps 13 are entering a trend. We'll have to wait another couple of election cycles to see if it is. But voters 14 15 seem to prefer the in-person voting process. For 16 whatever reason that may be, it's their option. All 17 we can do as the Board of Elections is present 18 options, and then the voters will avail themselves of 19 the options that we present. We also did a robust 20 poll worker recruitment campaign, where we recruited 21 about from the end of August, middle of August to the 2.2 end of September, and we recruited about 37,000 2.3 individuals with specific numbers in the testimony. Of the 46,000 that we recruited for the entire year, 24

37,000 came during that period of time, which is

25

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

about 80 percent of the new poll workers, and what 2 3 we're finding is that less and less of the poll 4 workers are coming from the party apparatuses, I 5 suppose, from each major party, and more from friends and neighbors who want to be civic-minded and 6 7 participate. So those are, I think, the highlights. 8 I'm sure that you all will have some questions on some other matters that are of importance to the Committee, and I'll be prepared to answer them when 10 11 my time comes. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you so much, Mr. Ryan, and now we'll go to the other Mr. Ryan.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Thank you,
Chair Restler and Committee on Governmental
Operations, State and Federal Legislation Members,
for the opportunity to appear before you today. I am
Paul Seamus Ryan, Executive Director of the New York
City Campaign Finance Board.

The CFB is an independent, nonpartisan

City agency dedicated to strengthening local

democracy. The CFB combats the influence of big money
in politics by amplifying the power of small-dollar

contributions from everyday New Yorkers through our

matching funds program, which serves as a model

25

nationwide. We work to eliminate barriers to 2 3 participation by equipping New Yorkers with the 4 information and resources they need to vote and run for office. Through our NYC Votes initiative, the CFB 5 directly engages with voters and provides resources 6 7 to make voting more accessible. Our mission is to 8 foster a democracy that is open, transparent, and equitable. I am honored to deliver testimony alongside the Board of Elections at this hearing 10 11 focused on election preparedness for 2025. This 12 hearing provides us with the opportunity to highlight 13 our new agency-wide strategic plan and other initiatives we are developing for next year's 14 15 elections and beyond. Along with other CFB 16 colleagues, I am joined today by Amanda Melillo, who 17 I am excited to share has been promoted to become the 18 Agency's first Deputy Executive Director. In this 19 role, Amanda leads our new Strategy, Products, and 20 Innovation Division, which includes implementing our 21 new strategic plan and, more generally, turning 2.2 vision into reality as we build the necessary tools 2.3 to ensure the CFB's successful future. Our new sevenyear strategic plan will take us through the 2029 24

election, which we expect to be the biggest in CFB

2	history. Under our strategic plan timeline, we will
3	work hard to improve systems, programs, and processes
4	between now and 2029 so that administration of the
5	Public Matching Funds Program and voter education
6	initiatives go as smoothly as possible and have the
7	greatest possible impact. In service of our vision,
8	mission, and core values of access, accountability,
9	equity, and transparency, we are reaching for the
10	following North Star goals by 2030. 90 percent of
11	audits completed within one year of the election for
12	candidates who do not request and receive extensions
13	with minimal increased risk. The second North Star
14	goal is 90 percent of candidates express high
15	satisfaction with CFB programs and services. The
16	third is 90 percent of voters find our information
17	and materials relevant, helpful, and accessible. The
18	fourth, 10 percent of eligible city donors make a
19	contribution in an election cycle. Fifth and finally,
20	90 percent of CFB employees express high engagement
21	with employment at the CFB.

22

23

24

25

Our staff has been hard at work developing concrete shorter-term goals to move us towards these longer-term North Star goals. For example, with respect to auditing, we've committed to

a benchmark of completing 50 percent of audits within 3 one year of the 2025 election and will be starting

4 post-election audits immediately after the June

primary of candidates who are not in the general

election. 6

1

2

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Before I address each bill under consideration today, I would like to highlight some of our planned initiatives, many of which are already underway for the 2025 election. Our agency is committed to providing comprehensive voter-facing education on the Matching Funds Program to highlight its benefits. New Yorkers should know that their support for local candidates can make a real difference in races thanks to the Matching Funds Program's 8-to-1 match. That means that 10 dollars from your neighbors becomes 90 dollars for you to spend on a campaign about the issues that matter. The more everyday New Yorkers decide to run for office, the more choices voters will have in selecting leaders whose priorities align with theirs.

Our outreach and education efforts in 2025 will also focus on Ranked Choice Voting, or RCV. As in 2021 and 2023, we look forward to collaborating closely with the Board of Elections and our community

Τ	FEDERAL LEGISLATION 22
2	partners in all five boroughs to make sure all New
3	Yorkers understand how to vote a Ranked Choice
4	ballot. Some highlights of our plans include the
5	Voter Guide, printed and digital education materials,
6	and a targeted multimedia advertising campaign. The
7	Voter Guide, which is mailed to all registered voters
8	and published online, will include information
9	explaining RCV to voters as well as a mock-up of a
LO	sample ballot. This information will be communicated
11	in all 13 mandated languages, which are Arabic,
L2	Bengali, Simplified Chinese, Traditional Chinese,
L3	Korean, French, Haitian Creole, Hindi, Polish,
L 4	Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, and Urdu. We will also
L5	have a Video Voter Guide with ASL interpretation and
L 6	closed captioning on our website. Our other 2025
L7	printed materials, which include a standard and large
L8	print fact sheet with a sample RCV ballot, will also
L 9	be created and distributed in all 13 languages. Our
20	digital materials will be distributed in all mandated
21	languages too, including videos explaining RCV on
22	social media and web channels, and explanatory
23	graphics that direct viewers to information on the

NYC Votes website.

2 5

A targeted advertising campaign will kick off in April 2025, as most New Yorkers are starting to tune in to the campaign and run through the primary election on June 24th. The campaign will target all New Yorkers, but have a particular focus on our priority communities and languages, which I'll describe in a moment. This campaign will span all digital channels and include out-of-home placements throughout the city, including but not limited to bus shelters, radio, and subway ads. Advertisements will also be published in community and ethnic media outlets.

Every New Yorker should be able to engage meaningfully in our local democracy. Language access, which means providing information, services, and systems to enable New Yorkers with limited English language proficiency to effectively navigate voting and elections, is essential to making that vision a reality in 2025. New Yorkers have a right to vote in their language. It's our job to ensure they can access that right and build a democracy that is truly inclusive of and designed for all language speakers. By dismantling language barriers, we can help ensure that people who speak a language other than English

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 have just as much power at the ballot box as those 3 who speak English comfortably.

Guided by our Charter mandate, the CFP periodically analyzes quantitative and qualitative data to identify communities, both demographic and geographic, that are underrepresented in the electoral process in terms of voter engagement, registration, and participation. In our 2022 Voter Analysis Report, we identified five priority demographics: voters under the age of 30, immigrant voters, voters who primarily speak a language other than English, voters with disabilities, and voters who have been impacted by the criminal legal system. We also identified several priority geographic areas by analyzing U.S. census data, voter turnout, and the proportions of our identified priority communities that reside within each neighborhood or census district. The CFP has identified neighborhoods in the South Bronx, South Brooklyn, Northern Queens, and Central Queens as communities in need of targeted voter outreach because of the number of recently naturalized residents or residents that speak languages the CFP has not historically included in voter outreach.

organizations that serve underrepresented communities, such as the priority demographics previously discussed, to host voter education events across the city. At these events, we'll educate voters about what RCV is, how RCV works, and help them practice completing an RCV ballot. We'll host trainings for hundreds of students, volunteers, and community partners and provide them with the knowledge and the resources to educate their own communities about RCV. This is a train-the-trainer model that multiplies our reach.

2.2

2.3

We'll also incorporate RCV educational materials, including sample RCV ballots, into our multilingual direct voter outreach efforts, which will reach tens of thousands of New Yorkers in their communities, on the street, at community events, street fairs, parades, festivals, and wherever New Yorkers are gathering.

Now, turning to the bills before the Committee today. The first bill I will discuss is Intro. 1111, sponsored by Council Member Schulman. This bill proposes recalculating campaign

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

contribution and expenditure limits based on changes 2 3 in the Consumer Price Index after every general 4 election, rather than every four years as required by the current law. This bill would address a situation 5 that arises once every 20 years when Council Members 6 7 serve two-year terms due to redistricting. Under 8 current law, contribution and expenditure limits were adjusted in early 2022 and will not be adjusted again until early 2026, requiring Council candidates to run 10 11 under the same limits in 2023 and again in 2025. This bill would require immediate adjustment of Council 12 13 candidate spending limits for the 2025 elections, but 14 the contribution limits provisions would not take 15 effect until 2026. We do not have a formal position on this bill. We would like to work with the Council 16 17 to ensure we correctly understand the provisions 18 related to CPI adjustments so we are best able to 19 implement this legislation if enacted.

The next bill I will discuss is Intro.

565, sponsored by Council Member Brewer, which would require the CFB to create and routinely update guidance on procedures under New York State election law for making certain voter records confidential.

The Office to End Domestic and Gender-Based Violence

2.2

2.3

would be responsible for distributing the guidance to individuals receiving services at family justice centers. In the past, our Public Affairs Division has conducted outreach efforts to partners who serve this community and have promoted our educational materials to domestic violence survivors. We support this bill and welcome the opportunity to formalize these efforts and partner closely with the Office to End Domestic and Gender-Based Violence to ensure they deliver our guidance materials to impacted populations.

Next, I would like to discuss Intro. 293, sponsored by Council Member Menin. This bill prohibits sharing, within 60 days of a City election, manipulated media that falsely depicts a local candidate's speech or actions as genuine, intending to influence election outcomes or harm the candidate's reputation. The CFB is deeply committed to working alongside the Council to protect the integrity of our local democratic process and uphold public trust. While this bill does not create any mandates on the CFB, I do want to note the unsettled legal landscape surrounding this issue across the country. Nineteen states have enacted legislation

2 seeking to address this issue, and several have been
3 challenged in courts on First Amendment grounds,

4 including laws in California, Texas, and Minnesota.

This statute, as drafted, may face similar

6 constitutional challenges. We would be happy to offer

7 our recommendations to the Council to ensure the

strongest, most legally defensible version of this

9 bill is developed.

1

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Resolution 189, sponsored by Council Member Ung, is of great importance to the CFB. This legislation calls on the New York State Legislature to pass an amendment to the New York State Constitution to move New York City elections to evennumbered years. We are thrilled to see this resolution reintroduced in the 2023-2024 Council session. Citizens' Union focused an entire 60-page report on this subject in December 2022, which inspired us to recommend this policy change in our 2022 Voter Analysis Report and again in our 2023 Voter Analysis Report. Under our current election system, even with 82 percent of New Yorkers registered to vote, only a fraction of New Yorkers turn out to cast ballots in odd-year City elections, with many expressing voter fatigue and election

_	
2	burnout. Shifting local elections to occur alongside
3	state and federal elections would also save taxpayers
4	the 30 million dollars it costs to administer each
5	stand-alone local primary and general election, even
6	when only 7 percent of the city shows up to vote.
7	Beyond increasing turnout for local elections that
8	shape our day-to-day lives, consolidating elections
9	would also increase representation among those who
10	participate, especially young voters and voters of
11	color. Research shows this to be true in
12	municipalities across the country that have made
13	similar moves. Last year, Governor Hochul signed
14	legislation that shifted most county and local
15	elections to even years to limit election fatigue and
16	boost voter turnout. A comparable change for cities,
17	including New York City, requires a constitution set
18	in motion by legislation at the State level. The more

The final pieces of legislation do not create new mandates for the CFB. Still, we would like to express our support for both Intro. 441 and Resolution 322. Both further our mission to engage

closer we are to a just and representative democracy.

New Yorkers participate in local elections, the

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.2

2.3

3 access across the city.

The CFB appreciates the opportunity to provide testimony and feedback on the bills under consideration by the Committee today, and we remain dedicated to collaborating with the Council to ensure that the 2025 election is the most open, transparent, and equitable in City history. Thank you again for the opportunity to testify. I welcome any questions.

underrepresented communities while expanding language

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Well, thank you both for your thoughtful testimony. I think I'll go with Paul and Mike, if you don't mind, to just avoid confusion.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you. I just want to begin by congratulating Amanda on her promotion to First Deputy Director at the CFB. Look forward to working together. Also just wanted to say, you know, Mike, I think that during your tenure, the reputation of the Board of Elections has continued to improve, which is no small feat, and I want to credit you and the team for that. I want to just say, Paul, in the months that we've worked together, I've been

2.2

2.3

joke.

really impressed by your deep expertise in this work
and your integrity and appreciate you both being here
today.

So, I'd like to just dig in on a topic, and then I'll kick it over to Colleagues for questions, and then I'll pepper you all with lots of more questions after that. These questions, I think, pretty much will all be for Paul for this round. So, the CFB recently adopted changes to its rules and made some internal policy shifts to clarify when payments can be withheld from campaigns. I'd like to recognize those positive steps that you've made to help somewhat narrow loopholes. Under the recently adopted CFB rules, it will now be mandatory for the Board to withhold payment for specific contributions if a candidate fails to provide information requested by the Board. What types of requests are captured in this rules change?

I just want to recognize Council Member

David Carr of Brooklyn. Thank you for joining us. He

now represents a little bit of Brooklyn, and we're

claiming him as our own.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: It's an ongoing

2 CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Sorry, Paul.

1

3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Types of 4 records and requests for information that will be covered by this rule. The most important elements of 5 this rule are that, number one, the Board has always 6 7 had and exercised some discretion in how to interpret 8 and apply this rule. This rule is actually implementing a provision of the Act that's quite similar, and the Board, in this new rule, as revised, 10 11 the new rules will take effect, I believe, December 12 17th, there is clearly stated at the end of the rule 13 a materiality standard, that the Board may exercise its discretion. It may, in fact, award public funds, 14 15 grant public funds to a candidate if the Board 16 determines a requested document, record, or other 17 information is immaterial to public funds 18 eligibility. So, I'll give you one example of when, 19 and this is completely hypothetical, the Board makes 20 these decisions, I'm obviously not on the Board, and 21 the Board, to my knowledge, has not in my presence 2.2 considered the following example, but it struck me as 2.3 perhaps effective to illustrate. If a campaign, for example, failed to give to us a receipt for a 23-24 dollar expenditure at an office supply store, we ask, 25

2	you know, you've run, we ask candidates for all sorts
3	of receipts, lots of documentation. My personal view,
4	again, not speaking for the Board Members themselves,
5	is that a failure to produce such a receipt would not
6	likely be material, I can't imagine a scenario in
7	which that would be material to public funding
8	eligibility, so that under this rule, if I were on
9	the Board, if I were the one interpreting this, I
10	would be unlikely to deem a candidate ineligible for
11	public funding as a result of their failure to
12	produce this rule so there will be some judgment
13	calls made by the Board when making public funding
14	determinations. Always has been, always will be. As
15	you know, the first public funding payment decision
16	is coming up on December 16th, so the Board has some
17	decisions to make in about a week and a half, and
18	they'll be considering all relevant facts and
19	applying all relevant laws as they exist today, and
20	again, this rule doesn't actually take effect until
21	the day after the first public funds payment, but

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I'd also like to just ask about the internal policy shift that we've discussed previously. Historically, if a campaign

this rule is quite similar to its predecessor.

22

23

24

25

2.2

2.3

submits a donation for matching funds, the CFP provides those matching funds, even if there are outstanding questions on whether the donation is eligible to be matched. For instance, if an intermediary may be on the Doing Business Data List or something like that, you're now planning, as I understand it, CFP is now planning to not provide matching funds until more information has been received. Is that correct? Could you explain what the shift in policy is?

in policy for the 2025 election specifically related to intermediaries and our Suspected Intermediary Reports, which are a report that is attached when necessary and appropriate as deemed by staff to statement reviews that go out to campaigns. If a campaign does not respond to a Suspected Intermediary Report, we will assume what is effectively the worst-case scenario, which is that the contribution is not matchable because it has come through someone in the Doing Business Database. Generally speaking, intermediaries, the fact that a contribution comes through an intermediary is not relevant to legality of the contribution. It's perfectly legal to use

4

1

5 6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

18

17

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

intermediaries, and typically contributions made through intermediaries are matchable. If they come through an intermediary that's in the Doing Business Database, they're not matchable. So going forward in 2025, proactively on the front end, we'll say that if we've sent you a Suspected Intermediary Report, you have not responded to that report, we are not going to match any contributions flagged in that Suspected Intermediary Report.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Great. Positive developments both.

Could you just briefly explain why the CFB decided to implement these new rules and policies?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: That decision on that policy is really made in the broader context of contemplating generally our interpretation and enforcement of our power to get responses from campaigns when we ask them for documents and materials. The decision was not driven by any particular campaign, but more so one thing that has been a pain point for this agency. As you know, as I testified before you in the spring, I got a lot of questions from you about audits, length of our

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

audits. What we've come to realize is that one of the major reasons our audits have taken so long in recent years is because we've been exceedingly generous for campaigns that have asked us for extensions. We have a policy change there that I can speak to in a moment, but it's not directly responsive to your question, but another issue is that we ask campaigns for material that we need, information and documents we need to conduct audits, to complete our assessment of those campaigns, and if we don't get them, it lengthens the audit process itself generally, because we ask again. We have to badger candidates sometimes to get the materials. We have power under current law to simply deny matching funds for documents and information when campaigns are non-responsive. It's just one tool among several that we're beginning to utilize to speed up our audits and oversight of campaigns.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I do want to just take a second to recognize two more friends and colleagues from Brooklyn, Council Member Inna

Vernikov and Council Member Shahana Hanif.

Just digging in a little bit more on this decision that's pending before the Campaign Finance

2 Board in i

2.2

2.3

Board in just over 10 days around matching funds disbursement. Under the Campaign Finance Act, to qualify for matching funds, candidates, not committees, but candidates, must agree to comply with certain terms and conditions for the provision of such funds. Is that right?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Yes, and they have to establish their eligibility. The burden is on the candidates to demonstrate and establish, prove their eligibility, receive public funds. Yeah, that's correct.

requirements is that candidates must "obtain and furnish to the CFB any information it may request relating to their campaign expenditures or contributions and furnish such documentation and other proof of compliance." That's Section 3703 Part D, although you knew that already. Could you explain how the CFB determines whether a candidate is in compliance with that provision?

essentially the same answer that I gave you moments ago to your question about the new rule or the amendment to the new rule. The rule that you asked me

about is implementing this specific provision of the 2 3 Act that you've now quoted from. Same standards 4 apply. The Board, since its inception in the late '80s, has exercised some discretion in order to 5 determine whether or not the information, material, 6 7 documents they've requested and perhaps have not 8 received, whether it's actually material to eligibility, and the Board over the decades has presumably, although this is my first public funding 10 11 payment cycle that's about to begin, presumably has 12 determined at some instances in the past that it was 13 lacking sufficient information to establish a 14 particular campaign's eligibility for payment on the 15 payment date itself. Another thing that I want to 16 underscore here is December 16th is the first of, I 17 believe, eight payment dates between now and the June 18 primary. The Board will be making decisions in many 19 instances with respect to the same candidates, 20 payment date after payment date after payment date, 21 and the way the process works is it is routine for 2.2 the Board to determine that a campaign has not 2.3 established its eligibility for a public funds payment on that date or has only established its 24 25 eligibility for a partial payment on that date, and

2.2

2.3

then the campaigns routinely work with us, our audit
team, our candidate services team, to provide us
missing information in order to have the
contributions that we have not yet matched on a
future payment date. So, this is a provisional law.
We have the legal authority to ask campaigns for
whatever information we need to make those
determinations. We've used that power for decades.
The Board has used some discretion, and the
discretion, I think, boils down to, is this
information or document important, is it material to
the eligibility for public funds?

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I do want to better understand how we define what is material. So, does the Board look at whether the candidate has responded to requests for information in past elections?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: The Board looks at all relevant information, specifically with respect to contributions, for example, public funding eligibility, which happens most routinely on a contribution-by-contribution basis. There are certain requirements that have to be met simply to get over the bar of becoming eligible for public funds, and then it gets to a granular level of, is this specific

1 contribution matchable. The Board does have a 2 3 threshold. Right now, it's an internal process, but 4 if we are missing information about specific contributions, that information is necessary to 5 determine the matchability, the legality of matching 6 7 that contribution. If that threshold exceeds 20 percent, for example, under current agency practice, 8 9 that campaign gets no public funds at all. That's sort of an anomaly indicator. If there are that many 10 11 problematic contributions, that many questions for 12 which the campaign has not yet given us the 13 information we need, no public funds on that payment date, but it's a case-by-case basis. As you will see 14 15 on the 16th, either the Chair or I, I'm not sure 16 which, will be reading the names of all the 17 candidates who are receiving public funds. It will 18 probably be the Chair. I think the practice has 19 varied in past election cycles. But, you know, case-20 by-case, candidate-by-candidate, contribution-bycontribution is how these determinations are made, 21 2.2 including but not limited to the specific provision 2.3 of the Act that you've quoted, requiring campaigns to

give us documents and information that we request.

24

2 CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: The Board also, I
3 presume, looks at timeliness of responses, lack of
4 responses to statement reviews, how many requests are
5 not responded to, is a part of that decision of

6 whether the campaign is in compliance with that

7 provision?

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Yes, I mean, the Board considers all relevant facts and information, whether or not you've responded, whether you've filed disclosure reports, whether those disclosure reports have been complete. I'll say one thing about the statement review. So typically, a statement review is not a firm demand for documents or information. By contrast, typically a statement review is structured as you filed it, we're in the midst of, you know, on the tail end of the statement review process, as you all know, for the early October filing deadline. A month later we sent out statement reviews, and now statement review responses are coming in from you and your treasurers. Due date is the January reporting deadline, but we advise campaigns, if we raised any questions in our statement review of your early October filing, regarding a contribution that you want to get matched

2	on December 16th, you need to respond to us by
3	November 22nd, a week and a half ago. That was the
4	deadline for our receipt of any information that we
5	will take into consideration when making payment
6	determinations on December 16th, that the Board will
7	rely on to make those determinations. So, when it
8	comes to these statement reviews, you ask
9	specifically about them, it really depends. They will
10	definitely impact the matching eligibility of
11	specific contributions if the campaign has not
12	satisfied its burden of proving that the contribution
13	is matchable. That doesn't mean that the campaign as
14	a whole is ineligible for public funds, and it
15	doesn't mean that the contribution that we flagged is
16	permanently ineligible for match. It means it will
17	not be matched on December 16th. I expect it will be
18	the case that campaigns that have not been as maybe
19	on top of things or that did not get back to us in
20	response to the statement review by November 22nd,
21	will nevertheless get, they are required to get back
22	to us by the January, I believe it's January 15th
23	filing deadline. They may establish eligibility for a
	1

contribution that then gets matched in January, not

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 in December, because of the way they chose to respond 3 to the statement review.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: And just to put a finer point on one of your earlier statements, the Board has the full authority to withhold all matching funds for a candidate at the December 16th disbursement.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Yeah, for a bunch of different reasons. There are sort of more routine and there are more complicated or less common reasons that the Board would hold public funds completely. For example, you're all required to file, everyone who's applying for public funds, file a disclosure statement with the Conflict of Interest Board. For the early payments, December, January, that's a partial COIB disclosure report for the first nine months of this Calendar Year, 2024. If campaigns did not file that disclosure report with the COIB, which then sends us a list, that's a hard and fast eligibility requirement to get paid on December 16th. If that wasn't filed and we were not alerted to that by November 22nd, you're not getting any public funds on December 16th, and that's one of many different specific required criteria that could render a

campaign completely ineligible to receive public funds on the 16th and then, again, at the more

4 granular level, it will be the case that there are

5 campaigns that get partial match of public funds.

They don't get matched every contribution they're

7 asking for that they've submitted because we have

8 questions about the eligibility for match, but they

9 | will get some public funds because they met the other

10 baseline requirements.

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I appreciate that you're speaking in broad strokes about the policies of the CFB, but I want to just put a name on this. You know, thanks to FOILs and reporting from Brigid Bergen at WNYC, we found that Eric Adams' 2021 campaign never responded to requests from the CFB for more information on suspected intermediaries. His campaign stopped responding to the CFB entirely after the June 2021 primary. You know, because some of this information is in the public sphere, I'd like to ask how many times has the Adams' 2021 campaign failed to fully respond to requests by the CFB for information?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: We have a very firm policy against commenting on any open audits or other investigations. I'm not at liberty to

2.2

2.3

comment at all on any matters regarding a specific candidate in that circumstance, and Mayor Adams is

one such candidate.

according to reporting by Brigid Bergen, the CFB sent 13 requests to the Adams' 2021 campaign since June 2021. The campaign partially responded to nine of them, never addressed intermediary questions, stopped responding to all CFB questions. Excuse me, the CFB sent a total of 13 requests for information to the Adams' 2021 campaign. The campaign partially responded to two-thirds of them, never addressed intermediary questions, and stopped responding entirely to the CFB for over three years.

I'd like to shift gears to the authority that is afforded to the CFB in your rules. Under Section 301-D of the CFB rules, candidates are also ineligible from receiving matching funds if they have "committed fraud or material misrepresentation."

Could you explain what that would entail?

you one example that occurred. I think this was the rule that was the basis for the final determination of ineligibility for public funds of the John Liu

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

campaign, which unfolded beginning a decade ago and concluding several years later, I believe in 2017, in which case the Board found that the Liu campaign was in breach of its certification, of its promises to abide by all the applicable laws and regulations to be eligible for public funds, and that breach of certification had to do with fraud and misrepresentation by campaign staff in the context of complying or failing to comply with campaign contribution limits and other campaign finance restrictions so it's a fact-dependent analysis, but fraud is a legally defined term. It's defined a little bit differently in different places. And, yes, it is a basis for the Board to determine that a campaign is ineligible for public funds.

in the federal indictment against Mayor Adams that he orchestrated straw donor schemes, directed his staff to route foreign donations through U.S. citizens, and intentionally sought to delete records and withhold information, and to the credit of the CFP staff, they identified some of these issues during the 2021 cycle. What else is needed to demonstrate fraud in this particular instance?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: I am not at liberty to comment on Mayor Adams and his campaign at all.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: The CFP rules grant the Board additional authority over pre-election payments. Chapter 7, Section 1 of the rules notes that "failure to respond to a request for audit documentation or information by the Board may be a basis for a non-payment determination." This gives the Board authority to fully withhold funds from a campaign that hasn't responded to a request for information. I think we've gone over this, but I just want to affirm again on the record that that's correct.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Yes, Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: How does the Board consider past election cycles for the same candidate when making a determination of this eligibility provision?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Some of the eligibility requirements apply only to the election cycle for which the campaign is seeking public funds, and some are susceptible to, although there hasn't

1

been much history or practice at the agency,

3 susceptible to being applied to fact patterns that

4 exist across election cycles. So, within the rules

5 themselves, for example, some of the rules are in a

6 Section under the preface of pre-election, and then

7 other of the eligibility or ineligibility rules are

8 under the Subsection of pre-election or post-

9 | election, and those that are within the pre-election

10 | framework have historically been interpreted by the

11 | Commission to apply only to violations of those types

12 relevant to or within the election cycle for which

13 | the campaign is seeking public funds and the Board is

14 determining eligibility for public funds. In other

15 words, those that are in the pre-election category

16 have historically been interpreted as not crossing

17 | election cycles, because right now, anything with

18 respect to a 2021 election, for example, that would

19 \parallel be a post-election determination of eligibility.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Right, but we're not yet at the post-election because we haven't completed the audit despite being three and a half years after the election, three years after the November

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

election, excuse me.

Can you confirm if the Adams' campaign submitted their audit response as they were required to do so on Friday, November 29th?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: I am not at liberty to respond to any questions regarding ongoing audit, including that of the Adams' campaign.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: So, just to recap for those who are keeping track at home, on July 31st, the Adams' campaign asked for an extension, and the CFB granted a two-week extension on their audit response, saying it would be the final extension. The campaign then asked for an additional extension, and on August 29th was granted a 90-day extension, which would be until November 29, 2024. The Adams' campaign, I believe, told a reporter today they did respond on the 29th. Are you able to advise broadly what are the next steps after that document is submitted by a campaign in the audit process?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: The draft audit report document? It will be analyzed by our audit team to determine the sufficiency of the responses to the issues that were raised in the draft audit itself and then, depending on what the audit team, this is not specific to any campaign, but as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

you had requested, general process, the audit team determines whether or not there are any outstanding legal issues regarding compliance with our campaign finance laws unresolved by the campaign's response to the draft audit. If there are no issues, they proceed to a final audit report, and that gets issued to the campaign. If there are legal issues, it gets referred to our legal department, which then begins the enforcement process, which, in short, amounts to drafting an enforcement notice that gets sent to the campaign to notify them of the Board's conclusions with respect to potential violations of the law and informs the campaign of their right to either appear before the Board or to go the OATH process to address those legal concerns by the campaign finance Board.

And you had mentioned length of audits. I alluded moments ago to another policy change, if I may tell you about it now, because it's directly related to extensions and audits. You just alluded to one specific example of a campaign requesting an extension to a response to a draft audit report. In my short term at the agency, I've been there nine and a half months now, it became quickly apparent to me, it's apparent to everyone, that the length, the

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

amount of time it's taken us to complete 2021 audits is not satisfactory at all. We need to figure out if there are good reasons that it happened the way that it happened. Our audit team has been working hard. I've shared all these reasons the last time I appeared before you. Now, looking forward, one of the biggest reasons audits have taken as long as they have is because campaigns requested extensions, and we granted them, and we granted them, and we granted them at every step of the process. This began in COVID, and perhaps we were too nice to candidates. I recognize this as a problem, and we quickly, our staff, within my first couple months at the agency, identified a solution. In October of this year, we've adopted a strict new policy limiting extensions in every phase of the auditing and enforcement process. This is the initial document request, the draft audit response, the enforcement notice response, no more than six weeks extensions total allowed to any campaigns, shorter in some circumstances. So, this is one of the linchpins in us speeding up audits in future elections. This new policy is going to take effect for the 2021 elections, and we're going to hear it. My colleague Dan Cho, who runs our candidate 2 services team, is here. He's going to hear it.

2.2

2.3

Campaigns aren't going to like it, probably, but it's a new day, and we have strict new limits on any and all extensions in the audit and enforcement process.

appreciate policy changes you're implementing moving forward, but I remain concerned about how the CFB, how the Board can make a determination on public matching funds when there are significant outstanding items of concern for a given candidate from the previous cycle. How can the CFB make a determination on future matching funds when there are so many outstanding concerns that a candidate may have from their previous campaign?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: I think the Campaign Finance Board itself has a lot of information at its disposal. Most of the campaigns from 2021 have been issued draft audit reports, and I believe you know, but if you don't know, I'll say it. I think I mentioned this the last time I appeared before you. The overwhelming majority of the work of researching potential violations and notifying the campaign, that all happens in production of the draft audit report. Ninety-seven percent of campaigns have

2 received their draft audit reports, 2021 campaigns.

3 So, our team is aware of whatever issues that our

4 team has identified, potential or actual, with

5 campaigns from 2021, and our Board has access to all

6 of that information. I think, you know, I have every

7 bit of confidence that our Board is going to do a

8 great job in two weeks, a week and a half, making

9 appropriate public funding decisions based on all

10 available facts and information.

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I will just wrap up this section by synthesizing my perspective, which is the Campaign Finance Act and the Campaign Finance Board rules make eminently clear that candidates, candidates like Eric Adams who fail to respond to requests for information from the CFB, repeatedly fail to respond to requests for information from the CFB, are not eligible for additional public funding. The Board has the full authority to withhold all funds from such candidates as you've testified today. Ideally, the funding spigot would have been stopped or slowed in the middle of the 2021 campaign when the candidate stopped responding to the CFB, but at a minimum, this candidate, who has ignored and stonewalled the CFB for years, should not receive

2.2

2.3

another dime until his campaign has answered all CFB requests for information and the CFB has determined the extent of the fraud that has allegedly been committed. I hope that you, Paul and Mr. Ryan, will encourage the Board to take the appropriate and necessary action on the 16th. This Committee, the Council, New Yorkers will certainly be watching.

I want to invite Colleagues to ask questions and then I'll come back so we'll do Council Members Brewer then Schulman then Menin then Carr then Hanif in that order.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you very much. Mike Ryan got off easy on that one. A couple of questions.

First of all, I appreciate the CFB's support of working with domestic violence individuals. So, I know that you're going to be working with the Mayor's Office and the Family Justice Centers. Are you also reaching out to people like crime victims and the folks from Safe Horizon and Muslim Community, etc.? In other words, how are you going about specifically doing the outreach?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: I will apologize. I have not yet been involved in that work

2.2

2.3

in my first nine months at the agency. I would be more than happy to confer with my Head of Public Affairs, Eric Friedman, who's here today, and we will follow up with you. We do work very closely with a lot of community-based organizations. I don't know which ones specifically so if I may ask your indulgence and get back to you on that question.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Absolutely. I mean, I do think it's good to have a law on the state level, but the reason we have this bill is because it's not being implemented, and that's where the rubber hits the road. All right. Thank you.

I also want to say good things about Logan Gonzalez. Wonderful staff member.

In terms of the Board of Elections, I am interested in Rikers Island. I know that we spoke, and I understand there is an issue about putting any kind of a polling site there because people are not residents, but what I don't understand is, like, if my kid goes to a college upstate, I mean, he can vote in Binghamton, but I guess, I don't know, I don't think of him as a resident there. He's four years, and then he's coming home. So, I guess my question is, can you explain about the polling site issue? And

2.2

2.3

then also, the group that's been working on trying to get people registered there deserves huge accolades. They're really working hard. So, I want to know between you and the Department of Correction, and how is the coordination taking place, because we do need to get all those people, many of them, of the 6,000 are eligible to vote, as we know so the question is, how do we get more of them to vote? What are you doing about that?

right. So, I'll take the first part of your question first. Where a voter is registered is largely up to the voter. So, if someone's child went to college, they'd have two options. They could either vote from home, where they are, and vote by absentee, or they could vote upstate New York, let's use that as an example, by registering to vote in the county in which they are present so that's up to the individual voter. Individuals that are being held on Rikers Island don't have that option, and so the New York State law provides for incarcerated individuals to vote by absentee ballot, and the New York City Charter has a program through the Department of Corrections. I can provide to you, I don't know if I

2	have, I can provide to you our response letters,
3	which we have done over the past several years, and I
4	will tell you that, and I'll mention her name and
5	she'll be mad at me, but Georgea Kontzamanis has
6	spearheaded efforts with the New York City Department
7	of Corrections where we have streamlined for them
8	their processes. For example, they have the staff
9	that they have, and they had been previously
10	hopscotching, to use a term, around to all of our
11	local offices to both deliver absentee ballot
12	applications and receive completed absentee ballots.
13	To make that more streamlined for the Department of
14	Corrections, we have designated pick-up and drop-off
15	dates at the Queen's office, most adjacent to Rikers
16	Island, and so all of our offices internally transmit
17	those documents via inter-office delivery to the
18	Queen's office so that we have a single point of
19	contact for the Department of Corrections, and that
20	seems to have been a much better result from them. We
21	also engaged in a little bit of education to the
22	Department of Corrections because there are specific
23	provisions within the City Charter and windows of
24	time that the Department of Corrections has to

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 perform this work, and we reminded them of that and 3 also indicated to them...

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Were they receptive to that reminding?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: They absolutely were receptive. I can tell you that our goal always, and we have various government partners, is to partner with our government agencies and be instructive where we can and to avoid, shall we say, sniping at other agencies when they're working hard to try to do their jobs as well. So, we have worked with them in that regard. We made some suggestions which we think they were receptive to and also will improve the process. So, for example, if they're having someone in January register to vote, they had a practice of also giving them an absentee ballot application at that time. Well, given the transient nature of the corrections population, that's not necessarily a good idea unless you know that there's a special election coming up because that individual may very well no longer be in the correctional facility at the time that the election happens so we reminded them of those windows of time when the absentee ballot applications should be distributed on

the Island and then returned to us. We have data, and I know that Ms. Kontzamanis has kept very specific 3 4 data on this, we'll be happy to share that with you 5 after the hearing is over and give you an update of our efforts, but I can tell you, I think, at least 6 7 from the feedback that we had, and we did have at least one meeting that I attended and more that 8 staff, including Ms. Kontzamanis, has attended with the Legal Aid Society, so that they understand what 10 11 we're doing, what our efforts are, and so that they 12 can be the eyes and ears on Rikers Island to make 13 certain that these efforts are bearing fruit. I know that the process has improved. I am certain that it 14 15 will continue to improve and that there's room to 16 grow the process even more.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay. If there's a problem, because obviously people may not be living, you know, people who have different addresses, you can see this is a population that has a challenge just filling out a form, so if there are problems with the registration, how do they get it fixed, so to speak? Does it go back through the non-profit that's working with them? I could just see all

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

1

2

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

It seems to be from our end.

challenges along the way. I'm staying with my uncle,
I'm staying with my sister, etc.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Right. So, the way the process works is whatever we're going to send back to Rikers Island goes through that internal delivery process that we've established. So, for example, if somebody forgot to sign their voter registration form, we would have to process a missing signature letter. Rather than do that and just simply mail it to Rikers Island, where they may or may not be, we have it redelivered back through that process the same way that we would do with an absentee ballot application or a completed absentee ballot package so that's how we're doing that. We've streamlined that. There's much more communication. I would say that heretofore, the Department of Corrections and the Board of Elections were more or less operating as separate entities doing their own thing. We were doing what we were supposed to do, but having that integrated effort certainly has improved the process, and I'd be interested to hear what the post-election feedback from the Legal Aid Society is to see if they share our view that there was a marked improvement.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: No, I think it's improved. The issue is, if we were to get a polling site, that would require State legislation to change how it...

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Yes. Our position has been, and it's been for the last number of years, that the State law provides for an absentee ballot process.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I understand that.

those who are incarcerated. Now, when you look at the way that we have to establish polling locations, they're established on an election district and assembly district model. That does not speak well, or translate well, I should say, to a transient population where individuals could come from anywhere in the five boroughs of New York City. But be that as it may, we do not believe, and the State Board of Elections, we've checked it and double-checked it to make sure that we're just not simply being resistant for the sake of resistance. We've checked with the State Board of Elections, and we have received guidance that our interpretation is correct, and that the manner in which individuals who are incarcerated

NYC3, are cybersecurity issues that relate to our

24

25

communication.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENIN: So, before we turn to the CFB, so in the instance that I just mentioned, does the Board of Elections even receive complaints about AI? If someone wants to lodge a complaint, is that something that you receive and that you publish that data?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: We haven't received any complaints in that regard in my 11 years at the Board of Elections. We have had other complaints, and some that we have generated, with respect to the co-opting of campaign websites and e-mails and such, but not directly related to AI.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENIN: Okay, and then for the CFB, so what are the legal consequences of this conduct?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: The

Campaign Finance Board doesn't have any jurisdiction

over the content of such political advertising. This

agency, the Campaign Finance Board, was created to

enforce and administer the laws around money in

elections. I have personal interest in this issue,

because my background is 25 years of election law

more generally. So, in preparing for this hearing, I

talked to colleagues who have been following this

25

issue quite closely, and the litigation around 2 similar laws passed in other jurisdictions. It's a 3 4 problem, deepfakes, you've described it aptly. It's a problem everywhere. Many jurisdictions are wrestling 5 with how to address it effectively, and we're at the 6 7 stage now where courts are advising, if you'll call 8 it that, they're ruling, they're judging whether the specific bills, the specific approaches that are being taken, are permissible under the First 10 11 Amendment so one of my observations with respect to 12 your bill, for example, is that it does not include 13 any exception for parody or satire. I'll back up a step. If I were writing on a blank slate, I would 14 15 have written something very similar to what you've produced and introduced. It's a great bill. I only 16 17 know because other laws like it have been challenged, 18 and other plaintiffs have said, what about parody and 19 satire, and courts have weighed in and have not 20 received favorably bills that lack exceptions for 21 that. Another issue in your bill that jumped out at 2.2 me was the phrase "the intent to influence the 2.3 results of a covered election or injure the reputation of a candidate." There's at least one 24

other state that has a similar bill, but it uses

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

of those boxes, which narrows the scope of application. It's a little technical details like that, but again, I mentioned in my prepared testimony, the Campaign Finance Board does not have jurisdiction over this issue. We do have some expertise, both with me and our legal staff.

"and" to connect those two so you have to check both

COUNCIL MEMBER MENIN: But you do have jurisdiction over matching funds. So, in the example that I gave, if you have a candidate that is now spreading misinformation about one of their opponents using AI, should that candidate receive matching funds?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: There's no eligibility provision in the current law that comes anywhere remotely close to scrutinizing the veracity of campaign ads as an eligibility criteria, but we would be happy to talk to you and your team about whether that's feasible and desirable policy. I think it's an interesting idea that, frankly, has not occurred to me before you brought it up.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENIN: I'd highly recommend it. We'd love to talk to you about that so thank you so much. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thanks so much.

3

4

10

1

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: And,

not with respect to AI, but I had occasion to be 5

Council Member, if I could just have one followup,

subpoenaed to testify in federal court in a 6

7 prosecution where an individual ostensibly on behalf

8 of a campaign sent out text messages with false

information regarding how you could vote. More

specifically, that you could vote by text to vote for

11 a particular candidate. The limit of my testimony

12 was, can you vote by text in New York State? No.

13 Hence, my expert testimony was concluded. But

14 unfortunately, the individual was a young man, and he

15 was, in fact, convicted in the Eastern District of

16 New York. So, there are tangentially related matters

17 that might not specifically relate to AI, but do

relate to other technology-related interference.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENIN: Thank you so much.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: You're

21 welcome.

2.2 CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Council Member

2.3 Shulman.

24

18

19

20

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Thank you, and thank you, Chair Restler, for this really important and enlightening hearing.

Mike, if I can say that, so one question I want to ask. I represent Queens, Central Queens, so on Election Day, as I'm sure you're aware, there were a large number of glitches at Queens sites, including ones in my District. I mean, my phone started blowing up at 6:30 in the morning.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: (INAUDIBLE) the same time.

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: A, what happened, and B, what's being done to make sure that doesn't happen again?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: So, we're still in the process of completing the postelection analysis with respect to that, and we're awaiting reports from two separate vendors, the election machine vendor and the ballot vendor. I think I can confidently state, but I will not say it with 100 percent certainty, that it was not a scanner issue, that it is likely going to be a paper-related issue, and so what we were able to do was we were able to leverage our field teams of technicians, both

25

2 Board employees and vendor employees, and basically 3 converge on Queens. The problem was isolated to 4 Queens, and what we were able to do was the temporary fix on Election Day, which got us through the day, 6 was to have the reader on the machine stop trying to 7 recognize the blank box on ballots where you would stamp it for affidavit and, once we did that, and 8 that was identified fairly early, but then it had to be done. Although it was limited to, I say limited, 10 11 not tongue in cheek, it was, there was 298 or 299 12 poll sites in Queens, and it was about 103 sites that 13 were affected. Although it was only affecting 100 sites, we made sure that we took that remedial action 14 15 across the entire borough so that if something popped 16 up later in the day, we wouldn't have that problem. 17 So yes, we put all our resources to it. We got the 18 problem solved as quickly as we could. I think that 19 the 100 sites, 103 sites, were remedied in about an 20 hour and a half to two hours, and it took a few hours 21 more to do the rest of the borough, but here's the 2.2 reality. We are supposed to get ballots for testing 2.3 from the print run that's going to be on Election Day, and we went through all that testing process, 24

and nothing came up in the testing process as having

_	
2	a problem so what we really have to do is take a look
3	at the paper. We're pretty certain that the paper
4	gauge is correct, but I'm going to use the term that
5	this is where we think we're going to end up, the
6	opacity of the paper may have been an issue where it
7	was too transparent, and then when that happens on a
8	two-sided, if the candidates were only on one side of
9	the ballot, it's not going to be a harm, but when the
10	candidates are on two sides of the ballot, the reader
11	is attempting to read both sides and, if ink is
12	bleeding through, it's going to cause interference
13	so, from our perspective, there was no way to
14	determine that it would occur prior to Election Day,
15	and we took all the efforts that we could, and it was
16	disappointing in the sense that you never want voters
17	to be inconvenienced in any way, and further
18	disappointing in that we were having a really great
19	election cycle, and then to have those calls start
20	right around the same time that you were getting
21	them, I was getting them, and we worked quickly to

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: And we'll look at it for the future to make sure that...

23

24

get it resolved.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3 24

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Right, so we're expecting reports from the machine vendor and also from the ballot vendor. We don't think the machines, again, not 100 percent, but we don't think the machines are going to be the issue. We think it's going to be the paper, but we still need to wait for ...

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: When you have those reports, can you send them to the Committee?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN:

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Share them,

thank you.

Certainly.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN:

Absolutely, and what we do after each election is we meet with all of our vendors, the poll pads, the machines, and the ballot vendors post-election to do an analysis, and areas where we think we need to make improvements moving forward.

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Okay, thank you. Chair, I may, I have a couple of questions. Okay, so it was very nice to meet you and your team finally. I'm sorry that I wasn't here for the last Committee hearing on the audits, but I just wanted to refer back to Chair Restler talked about trust in

government, trust in the election process, and all of
that so one of the things that I wanted to bring up
is the databases that you have, and I know that you
have a plan to update them and everything else. As an
example, when I give a contribution, I'm a City
Council Member, I have lived at my address for over

30 years. It keeps coming back, I have to reaffirm

that that is my address. People get upset about that when we go back to them, and people are reluctant to

give, to donate, and everything else, I want you to

12 address that for me.

2.2

2.3

essential elements of our situation, the campaign finance Board, is that we are using some legacy computer systems that were built a few decades ago. We've got a skilled head of technology and a technology team and a long list of to-do projects. I mentioned in my opening remarks, Amanda Melillo is my new First Deputy Executive Director, and she will be tasked in the process of standing up and running a new Strategy Products and Innovation Division, being sort of the matchmaker between our technology team, which in turn relies on some external consultants as well, and all of the other departments within the

25

Campaign Finance Board that have a list of things 2 3 they want fixed or created in terms of tech. We're 4 going to change, we are changing how we do tech, so one of the hallmark or characteristics of the legacy 5 systems that we're now working with is build it and 6 7 then let it go. Maybe revisit it for a modernization 8 effort five years, ten years later. We're not going to be doing that anymore. There's a better way to do tech generally, tech in government in particular, 10 11 which is constant updates, constant releases. It's an 12 approach to product management that we're adopting at 13 the agency that's different than the old way was waterfall management. You've got to figure out what 14 15 the business requirements are for the thing, and then 16 you build the thing and say, here it is, world, 17 contributors, candidates, internal staff, whoever the 18 user group is. And now we are starting with small, 19 testable, minimum viable products. What are the 20 minimum features we need in this new platform? So 21 right now, to give you an example, one of our highest 2.2 priorities is building a new digital tool, a new 2.3 software platform for how we calculate public funds payments. It's called the payment app or payment 24

platform. We're starting with the most essential

25

elements. What do staff need to make these 2 calculations accurately? The next release, sometime 3 next year probably, will be an interface for the 4 Board of Directors to access that information, to 5 streamline and modernize their engagement with this 6 material instead of getting a paper report, and I 7 8 could go on about how we're going to approach these different types of updates. That's in pretty much every facet of operations. I'll say two more things. 10 11 One of the problems with these legacy systems is that 12 they were quite siloed. Whatever data went into that 13 system, lived in that system, and was very difficult, 14 if at all possible, to move to other systems within 15 the agency. That's all changed. Our team has built out what we refer to informally as a data lake, and 16 17 the idea is any information that comes into the 18 Campaign Finance Board, any data whatsoever, lives in 19 this lake and then it gets pulled up and utilized by 20 whatever application needs it for whatever particular 21 purpose so all of these things, all of these ways 2.2 that we use technology that impacts stakeholder 2.3 groups, including candidates, contributors. It will all, I will promise you, will be improving. It's 24

going to take a few years, realistically, but we are

2.2

2.3

staffing up that work. We are going to do a better job than ever before of doing user experience testing. As we build, starting small, figure out with whoever the stakeholder group is so we're going to be convening user groups, whether they be candidates or contributors, you name it, every type of stakeholder that engages with us and letting them try out our new systems before we scale them big, before we spend a lot of money and time on them so we have plans. We know the systems are a little bit tough to engage with less than ideal user experience, and I assure you, it will be improved in the years to come.

and just going back to the audits, and I appreciate the new rule that you have but also understand that sometimes when the audits are done, like for example, I have a big donor base that's Orthodox Jewish, and so sometimes we've gotten audits when it's in the middle of a Jewish holiday so we can't access people or there are other things too so just keep that in mind as well, and I'm very compliant with stuff. One of the questions I wanted to ask you, instead of in terms of making the audits more timely, is have you thought about maybe just doing complete audits of

3

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

campaigns where there have been issues as opposed to campaigns that usually compliant and then just doing a quick overview or whatever as opposed to doing a complete audit of every single campaign?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Short answer is we already do what you're describing. We have a risk analysis system, and the degree of scrutiny on a particular campaign depends on a variety of factors. Our audit team is constantly evolving and improving that sort of rubric of how they assess risk, but campaigns that get a lot of public funds get more scrutiny than campaigns that get very little public funds. Campaigns that have a lot of red flags for problems get more scrutiny than those. We have several levels of scrutiny within the audit, including the least level of scrutiny, which is very little. So, we aren't doing full audits of every campaign today, and that will continue to be our practice.

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Okay, and the final question I have is, have you given any thought to maybe having a focus group with treasurers for campaigns because they have a lot of ideas, and they deal with the campaign on a day-to-day basis and

good idea to do that with some treasurers.

expect that our user testing for all of these systems process and tech system improvements, they're all going to involve more engagement with all of our users, including treasurers. It's a great idea, and we'll be doing more engagement to get feedback, welcome feedback from users of our...

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Okay, and I'd love to sit down with you at some point subsequent to this, but I appreciate all the work that you and your team do so thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: I would be honored, thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: And thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you very much,
Council Member Schulman. We will go to Council Member
Carr followed by Council Member Hanif.

2.2

2.3

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

24

correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER CARR: Thank you, Chair. Executive Directors Ryan, good to see you both. I'm

I just want to start by thanking the

glad to be here with you.

Board for really a completely successful election cycle in the areas I represent, Staten Island and Brooklyn, Chair, and that everything went really smoothly. Obviously, there's always a couple of hiccups here and there that's normal part of election cycle, but I just want to thank the Board staff and all the poll workers for their efforts over this October and November season. Really, really great.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Thank you, and we're happy to share you with our neighbors in Brooklyn.

COUNCIL MEMBER CARR: Thank you, I appreciate that. Happy to be back home where the family roots are.

So, I just want to start with the Board of elections. There's no voter ID law in New York State.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: That's

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER CARR: Ballot security
relies on a signature comparison, either when the
voter comes to a poll site and signs in the poll pad
or when they sign the envelope for the absentee
ballot that they return to the Board. Can you talk a
little bit about the protocols about how those
signatures are reviewed either by the poll workers at
a poll site or by Board staff when they receive an
absentee ballot?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: So, since we're not handwriting experts and having been a litigating attorney on cases requiring a handwriting analysis, that in itself is a complex science. It really is more a question of, does it look sufficiently similar, and if I am, I happen to be a Democrat and if we were working together, I would take a look at it. If it passed muster with me, it would turn over to you as the Republican and, if it passed muster with you, then it moves forward so it's really is it substantially similar? What is also a difficulty associated with that form of analysis is that we have permanent registration in New York unless there's some reason not to. I can tell you that my signature from 1992, which my card is from,

2 is different now than it was then so what we try to 3 do is when we have reasons to capture more recent signatures, we update what we call the signature clip 4 in the voter registration system so that we're having the most recent analysis, but it is certainly not a 6 7 perfect system. One of the other advancements that we've put in place to try to make certain that the 8 9 check-in process is more accurate on election day, and I meant to mention it before, we have the fast 10 11 pass tag, which we distribute to all registered 12 voters in the City of New York and did that this year 13 closer to election day than we have done in years past, and we also included a QR code on that form so 14 15 that you could put it into your Google Wallet or some 16 other similar means on your cell phone and that then 17 gives you a barcode that is specific to you as a 18 voter and so you can bring that to the poll pad and check in with that and it'll bring you right to your 19 20 voter registration page, and this election, we had 598,967 separate individuals use one or the other of 21 2.2 those two methods of checking in. If that can catch 2.3 on even more, considering that we had 2.8 million voters, it will not only speed the election's check-24 25 in process at the poll sites, I should say, but it

2.2

2.3

will also be a further insurance policy that the right person is checking in since each one of those is mailed out directly to the voters.

COUNCIL MEMBER CARR: I was one of the ones that had it in my Google Wallet. I enjoyed that process a lot. And my buff card signature is still Catholic Schools cursive, and that's not what my signature looks like anymore, so I appreciate those efforts.

But with respect to absentee ballots, the Board is required by statute, I think, to do a review of every signature that comes in. That's what takes place every election contest?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Yes, and because although we had some trepidation when the change in law was made to require the canvassing of absentee ballots ahead of election day, it has in fact been an enhancement to our efforts. In the past, we used to have, in this case, over 300,000, almost 400,000 absentee ballots and affidavits to review post-election in a very rapid process to get ready for, and especially in a presidential year, to be ready for certification and make sure that the electoral college can be properly set. Now we do them

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

policy.

at specific intervals as they come in, and the 2 3 process is not as frenetic, but it's still the same 4 thing that I discussed earlier, whether it be at the poll site or in the office on an absentee ballot. The 5 gateway to the ballot is the signature, and that 6 7 signature review process has to be completed by 8 individuals who are not necessarily handwriting experts, and it really is, does it pass the visual test, and does it pass the visual test on a 10 11 bipartisan basis and, if not, there is an escalation 12 process that could go potentially, well, it could go 13 potentially up to the Deputy Chief and Chief Clerk of 14 the Borough, or even the Commissioners. Now in my 11 15 years here, it's never gotten to the Commissioners, 16 but it could. That's the way it's written in the

COUNCIL MEMBER CARR: Appreciate it.

Chair, if I could just have another minute?

For the Campaign Finance Board, I just want to second what my Colleague, Council Member Schulman, was saying about differentiating how we approach audits or auditing at all for different campaigns, and I know for campaigns that don't receive matching funds, right, there's not the audit

2.2

2.3

of qualified expenditures that takes place, but when you were last here, I had asked about the notion of why do an audit at all when no matching funds are at play in a given campaign? The Campaign Finance Act empowers the Board to be stewards of the taxpayer dollars in these campaigns but, if no money's being distributed, why go through an audit at all, and I understand the law requires it, but why not support a change that would remove that responsibility from you and therefore reduce the workload of the Board?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: With respect, I think our mandate is broader than simply ensuring good use of taxpayer dollars in the public financing program. Our mandate is to ensure that all of the campaign finance laws, the full scope of the City's campaign finance laws, that apply both to non-participants and participants alike, are effectively enforced, and that's important because publicly financed candidates should be running against, if their opponent chooses to not participate, it would be difficult to administer an effective public financing program if candidates who opt in are subject to a bunch of laws and candidates who are not have no oversight and run roughshod over applicable

2.2

2.3

laws. Audits are a way of ensuring that it's a fair playing field between participants and non-participants alike, all candidates.

I don't think you need an audit to enforce whether or not someone received an over-the-limit contribution, right? You're going to know that upfront. There are other election agencies who enforce those kinds of laws without there being a matching fund system so I guess what I'm asking about is why a post-election audit, not the statement reviews that require you to document, you know, what you're doing, or to indicate that you're complying with general rules like contribution limits and the like. The audit's really about whether the matching fund system is being adhered to post-election.

it's also about whether campaigns actually spent what they said they spent on what they said they spent it on, for example. That's a big part of audit process, and the US Supreme Court has said, at least since 1976, that voters have a First Amendment right, a compelling Constitutional right to knowing how much money candidates are raising and spending in

2.2

2.3

elections, how they're spending that money, that it influences how voters make their decisions in the voting booth. I think the audits support that goal as well. I think transparency is an important goal, and the audits support transparency of all of the money that flows through campaigns, both fundraising and spending, and I think an audit is necessary, varying degrees, but an audit of some sort is necessary to confirm that candidates are spending money and raising money the way that they are saying they are, the backup paperwork.

COUNCIL MEMBER CARR: Understood. Well, I think it's something worth talking about, but I appreciate your answer. Chair, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thanks so much,
Council Member Carr. Council Member Hanif.

I have some questions about language access and interpretation services, specifically for this past general. I know that several sites lacked sufficient number of interpreters. Could you walk us through how a determination is made as to how many interpreters are placed in each site on election day?

2.2

2.3

I will say I would welcome the information about where those lacking sites were because that has not risen to my level of attention, and we do have other oversight agencies that are out in the field on election day. The Department of Justice was out in the field. The Attorney General's office has a hotline. What I should say, we didn't receive sufficient numbers of complaints to demonstrate to me that it was a problem but, if you have other information, we can take corrective action on specific locations moving forward...

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: (INAUDIBLE) are voters tasked with calling one of the hotlines or talking to one of the folks who are on site?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: I think all of the above. If something's happening in the field and it doesn't come back to us as having occurred, then there's no way for us...

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: What's that channel? The voter tells...

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: So there's different ways they can do it. They can report it at the poll site to the coordinator. They

can call our office hotline. As I said, the Attorney
General in particular and others have their hotlines
that they advertise on election day so if there's a
problem, they can let us know. Now, if it doesn't
happen on election day, which would be the best time
for us to know about it, so maybe we could take
remedial action on the fly, but if it doesn't happen
on election day and folks like yourself learn of
things, let us know, and then while we might be
generally doing a good job, there might be a specific
location that's a problem and, if we don't know about
it, we can't fix it. So, how we generally choose the
language representations is we work closely with the
Department of City Planning and they provide the data
on, we tell them where we need it for, they provide
it and then if the site, by our determination, is
more than 50, then we provide language assistance as
we are required under Section 203.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: If the site is more than 50?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: 50 individuals in the site that are reported as requiring services...

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: I see.

2.2

2.3

covered languages are, in addition to English,

Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Bengali, and I always
get it reversed, but suffice to say, in Chinese we
service Mandarin and Cantonese. One has to be spoken
and in writing and the other is spoken only. Then
once that is done, we make the assignments for the
election day poll sites. For the early voting sites,
it's a little bit different because they are
conglomerate sites. We do a similar analysis, but we
have to take then all of the election districts into
consideration that are going to be at that site and
we have no less than two assigned, no more than four,
depending on the needs of the particular location.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Got it. No, and I'm glad that you raised Bangla. That's one of the top languages in my District, particularly in Kensington. We've had some issues specifically at PS-179, PS-230, and I think even if there is an interpreter, the scope of voters knowing that there is an interpreter on site, that's one of the issues, that them not knowing.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Gotcha.

2.2

2.3

not being readily accessible on site and then if they are faced with challenges when it comes to interpretation services, not knowing who immediately to call, and of course, we're lucky that constituents can reach out to us, but it would be helpful to just have some more information so that that work can happen before the election day.

And then what other types of language assistance does the BOE provide in terms of ballots being language accessible?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: So, when areas like, and I'll use Queens as an example because it's the most, so we provide language in all five boroughs in English and Spanish, and then in certain areas of Brooklyn and Manhattan, they have met the threshold for also having Chinese, but Queens is our most complex borough in that regard. In some respects, it's the most language diverse, and we provide services in English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Bengali. Now that having been said, that doesn't mean that all five of those languages are serviced at all of the locations. It still is based on the threshold that I outlined earlier that we work

25

2 with the Department of City Planning so you might 3 have some sites that have all five. You might have 4 some that have four, some that have three. So, it has since become State law, but prior to it becoming State law, what we've done is, especially in those 6 7 locations where there was five languages, we started 8 a ballot rotation process to make sure that we never ran out of ballots in a particular language so, in other words, assuming the first three voters came in 10 11 and no one requested a ballot in a particular 12 language, you would get an English, Spanish, a 13 Chinese ballot, the next would get an English, Spanish, Korean ballot, the next would get an 14 15 English, Spanish, Bengali ballot, so that there was a 16 rotation. Now if you come in and ask for a specific 17 language, then you would get the ballot with that 18 specific language on it. For Spanish, we do not 19 translate the names because they have the same 20 alphabet, but for Chinese, Korean, and Bengali, you 21 get a translated name in addition to the instructions 2.2 and the offices and all of those other things, which 2.3 is why any candidates that have run for office in those areas get a notice from us in advance of 24

elections saying, this is the way we're going to

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

publish your name on the ballot and other related materials, do you have an objection or do you prefer a different way, especially with the character based languages? Sometimes there's a preference in how the name appears or what characters are used.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Right. So,

something that I keep thinking about, as somebody who's of Bangladeshi descent, speaks the Bangla language fluently, but born in Brooklyn, I've seen the community, one, feel really grateful that there's translated ballots, that they are receiving information in the language, but oftentimes incomprehensible so I'm curious if there's, outside of, I don't know who is doing the review for what gets translated, but would love to better understand if there is a structure to ensure that the translated material is comprehensive and comprehensible.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: So, depending on where it comes from, that depends on who's doing the translation. So, for example, we had some State and City propositions on the ballots this year. Those come to us as a finished product.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Those translations were terrible.

publish and also to be available throughout the year to serve as phone answerers and for people that are calling with specific language needs.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Yeah, the community has found it helpful to be able to bring someone with them to the site, which I think, yeah, that's helpful.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: In that regard, anyone has a right under New York State election law to bring someone to assist them in filling out the ballot. That's not only somebody that needs language assistance. If they had manual dexterity issues or comprehension issues, especially for some of the more complex things, you're allowed to bring anyone of your own choosing, provided that it's not your employer or your union, interestingly as the law requires to, I guess, prevent going back to Tammany Hall days interference or coercion on the part of an employer or a union to try to compel someone to do something that wasn't voluntary.

COUNCIL MEMBER HANIF: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: You're

welcome.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thanks so much,

I will do some questions, kick it over to

I just want to focus on turnout for a

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 2.2

2.3

24

25

moment, which is, I think I said in my opening,

abysmal. I think 23 percent in the 2021 general

election that led to Eric Adams' victory. We looked

Council Member Brewer, who I know has a round two,

and then try to wrap this panel up with a few more

back at the historical data, and the BOE keeps all of

this on its website. If you don't enjoy it, you

should. It's awesome. Maybe this is just something

that Molly and I enjoy.

Council Member Hanif.

questions after that.

knew you were going to ask us about it, we would have taken it down before the hearing. Teasing, teasing,

of course.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: When Robert Wagner

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: If I

was elected in 1953, if I have this right, over 2

million people turned out for the Mayoral election,

93 percent of registered voters. We've gone from 93

percent in 1953 down to 23 percent in 2021. About

half as many people turned out to vote to help elect

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Eric Adams. You commented, each of you, a little bit
on this in your opening statements, which we heard
and appreciated. Is there anything new or additive
that you'd like to share now of how CFB and BOE are

going to try to enhance turnout for the upcoming
election cycle, improve efficient election

8 operations, or any top line, big picture priorities

9 for how we're going to try to do better as a City?

would take this first, and I don't mean to jump you, but this past election, we did something different for the Presidential election. The State Legislature has shifted the dates a couple of times in the last few years about when we have to send out the annual information notice. It used to be in August, which made sense, when there was a September primary, and then a November general election. They moved it to another date, now it's a new date in May, but we made a determination that, and we're going to have to see moving forward, whether it's something that's sustainable for each general election, but we thought for sure, for the 2024 Presidential election, we also

did a supplemental mailing. So, when I told you that

we did outreach with respect to the poll workers, we

25

to do in May.

2 kind of bifurcated that process, and we halved our 3 budget, and used half for the poll worker outreach, 4 and half for voter outreach in the lead-up to the election, and we did, in addition to all of those efforts, which were multimedia efforts, and digital 6 7 platforms, and social media platforms, we also did a 8 mailer, which I hope that you received, to all registered voters, reminding them that the general election was coming up and we included the Fast Pass 10 11 tag in there and the QR code in there. It wasn't as 12 comprehensive a mailer as we do in June, but it was 13 really just a, hey, the election's coming up, we want 14 you to remember it, and we want you to have the 15 information. With respect to the upcoming election in 16 the June primary, what we've done, especially in the 17 past year since RCV has become into law in 2021, 18 while the Charter mandates the CFB with the primary 19 responsibility vis-a-vis voter education, we work 20 closely with the CFB to make sure that they have the 21 right information from us, whatever's necessary for 2.2 us to distribute, and then we supplement that as well 2.3 in our mailings, both in our voter education outreach, and in the mandatory mailing that we have 24

2 CHAIRPERSON RESTLER:

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Paul, anything you'd

like to add?

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: I think there's a silver bullet, and it's the policy change that is advocated by Resolution 189. It's aligning City elections into even year with federal elections. When we were contemplating designing or developing our strategic plan that we finalized in August, we were thinking about whether we should have a voter turnout North Star goal, and as we considered it, we thought it would be so dependent on, we'd want to set something ambitious, a big number, get us much closer to the voter registration number or much closer to federal election participation voter turnout, and it's so dependent on this realignment of elections so that's the big one, and that's why we support Resolution 189, that's why we're advocating that change, but the one other thing we're doing that's a little bit more modest is just really studying whether or not the educational materials that we're producing and disseminating to get voters to the polls, whether they're working, whether they're landing. So, we did incorporate that as a North Star goal, which is whether 90 percent of our voters find

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

our information materials relevant, helpful, and accessible. It's measurable, and it's going to force us to do some message testing and get a little more scientific to try to move the ball in that direction.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Chair

Restler, if I could just supplement that. While there hasn't been a legislative initiative in my time as a Commissioner, in my time as the Executive Director that the Board of Elections has not been able to meet, we meet our statutory requirements, I just would like to say that as this moves forward, and we'll work with the State legislature, that there are complications associated with aligning the elections in the even years and I'll point out two basic ones. We cannot merge a rank choice voting ballot on the same page as a non-rank choice voting ballot so if there's going to be City Council and Mayoral races in primary elections with other mixed races, there will be separate ballots so that's a challenge in voter education, not so much a challenge in technology. But moving forward into the Presidential election, staying away from the regular other elections, but if you move into the Presidential election, there are challenges associated, assuming that the same voter

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

system that we have presently remains in place. There are challenges associated with the volume of paper that's going to be associated by multiple page ballots. We had a few counties that had it, there were the larger counties this year, but that would increase the likelihood that the ballots would be multiple pages for the general election. Not insurmountable, but certainly things to be aware of.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: (INAUDIBLE) operational challenges. I appreciate you raising both. Look, there's a few things I want to say on this. Firstly, you both are agency heads with the rare power to essentially set your own budgets with our cooperation, and I really hope that both of you look hard at our abysmal turnout rates and ask, are there additional investments that we as a City can and should be making that would have a consequential impact on turnout and, if there are ways that we as a Council can be helpful in supporting the BOE and the CFB to achieve those goals, we want to. I think it's critically important, and I think that the status quo is unacceptable. I'm a profoundly competitive person, and it pains me immensely that when we look at all the other big cities in the country and their mayoral elections, they have higher turnout than we do in New York City. And if you look at the Presidential participation rates that we had just a couple weeks ago, we compare horribly to the big cities around the country. We can and should do so much better.

Lastly, I did want to ask about...

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Can I just say one thing about that?

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Sure.

position that you take is accurate if the voter rolls of eligible voters are accurate. So, to the extent that there may be people on the voter rolls anywhere, not only in New York City, but anywhere in New York State, that no longer belong there because they've relocated, it is artificially depressing our turnout rate, right, because the turnout rate's a hard number, who shows up is a hard number, but the soft number is the eligible voters registered. So, if that soft number is weak, then the turnout rate's going to appear to be lower when it's not really lower.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: So, basically what you're saying is if we can achieve universal child

2.2

2.3

for anybody involved.

2.2

2.3

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: What I'm suggesting is something different than then. I'm talking about there's instances where people move to other states and they're unlike, say, for example, I'll put an old hat on. (INAUDIBLE)

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: (INAUDIBLE)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: The NCIC, right? The Incident State Cooperation of Sharing Criminal Justice Data.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Right.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Right?

The states do a good job at that and a much better

job post 9/11, but it was on the road before that

because I was involved in it, but there is no such

similar mechanism in between the states so if

somebody picks up, like a lot of people have recently

moved to Florida, we don't get a notification from

Florida and Florida gets no notification from us

because there's no way to do it. There's no mechanism

to do it.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I would welcome the opportunity to look into this further with you and, if we don't have much cooperation or competency out of Washington, D.C. for the foreseeable future,

3 stat

4

1

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

perhaps there are opportunities for us to build more state partnerships.

Just one question I wanted to ask, I think Paul, on this Resolution 189, which I think is a meritorious idea, and I agree with you, could have a transformational impact on voter turnout. I do have anxiety about voter education for a ballot that could be so long. In 2021, in my community, there was an open Council seat, an open Borough President seat, an open Comptroller seat, an open Mayor election. In 2022, there was an open Congressional seat, a competitive Senate election and, in a Presidential year, we're talking, it's really, we had a new State Senator redistricted in our community. That is a lot of information for somebody to process in a given election cycle, and I just wonder how you think this would work for a voter to have to track 10, 12 different election races and candidates in a single voting experience.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: We know that it's working in jurisdictions that do it, that have municipal, county, state, federal elections aligned on a single ballot. I haven't done the research. I'm confident that my team and folks at the

that I referenced in my opening remarks and my

2

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

continue to do the research, but there are other jurisdictions that have had dramatic improvements in

Citizens Union who produced a report a few years ago

testimony, I think they have done that research, they

voter engagement, voter participation with aligned elections, with long ballots, and I'm not sure New

York City is unique that would make it not follow the

same trajectory if we were, in fact, to align our

elections with the federal.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Yeah, I think I'd be interested in your team's analysis and what we'll ask Citizens Union as well, do we have more positions that we vote for here in New York City than in other places? I don't know the answer to that. It's just, I think, an unusual thing in local government to have one, two, three, four, five, six different elected officials that represent, or five different elected officials that represent every New Yorker at the local level, you know, in addition to the state and federal representation.

Okay, I think we've covered my questions on the Queens scanners from Council Member Schulman.

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I did want to ask, I thought the innovation of the website that tells people how long the wait time is was really helpful and a great job. A couple blocks outside of my District over at Atlantic Terminal, NYCHA development in Fort Greene, people were saying they waited four hours to vote. I think there were particular instances there. When you have 1,200 poll sites around the city, I get you're going to have issues in some places, but could you share with us how many poll sites did the BOE identify had longer wait times than you think appropriate and what does the BOE do after an election cycle to revisit which poll sites had issues and what changes, if any, need to be made to shift election districts around, improve operations, change staff, etc.?

timing of this hearing every year kind of puts us in a little bit of an information deficit since we just certified the election yesterday so we haven't turned our attention to the post-election analysis, but we will, and we'll look at those locations that had more excessive wait times. The good news is the implementation this year and the trying it out for

the first time in the general election of the wait time data will provide us new ground to analyze. We didn't have that information in the past. Everything was anecdotal so, for the first time, we're going to have some real data other than just, oh, I've been waiting for three hours, right, I mean, so, yeah, we're definitely taking a look at it. We're...

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Do you plan on issuing a report?

be included in our annual report, I'm sure, but it is a different system for election day than it is for early voting, and we're still working, you know, some of the kinks out of it, but we know it's a work in progress, and we thought it was a good idea to try it out, even though it was a Presidential election and a big effort to do it. We thought there's no perfect time to implement something like that so we took the opportunity to do it now.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I think a step in the right direction, we're very interested in digging in on the data with you and understanding what the issues are and how they're rectified moving forward

2 so look forward to better understanding what you find.

I think, as I mentioned in my opening statement and in yours, a lot of progress on early voting, happy with the increase in the number of sites. I am a big proponent of cultural institutions, libraries, colleges, government buildings as early voting locations. We encounter a bunch of issues when our secondary schools are used, and they lose their gym for a week on end, etc., or their cafeteria space. Can more information be shared with Council Members when you have gaps in optimal early voting locations so we can help recommend alternative spaces in our communities?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN:

Absolutely. I think what we can do collectively is work on a communication process to make sure, rather than, I mean, there's, you know, a large number of City Council Members throughout the city, if there's a way that we can work collectively through staff to share that information.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Our Committee would be happy to help.

2.2

2.3

think that's a good idea because too often, and
Council Member Brewer will tell you in her various
capacities, she's been helpful to the Board, but too
often we're forging on our own at trying to find poll
sites and, you know, unfortunately, there are times
where we meet resistance in that regard. With respect
to the cultural institutions, although I don't know
that we're 100 percent where we want to be, there has
been a marked improvement...

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I joined Common

Cause for a press conference on the first day, or

just before the first day of early voting outside the

Met, which we were thrilled there was a new polling

site.

was a tough road to get there for some of those locations, but I will tell you, you know, and again, I mention Georgea again, but Ms. Kontzamanis can tell you that where we really kind of started this and it kind of broke the ground was the Museum of the Moving Image in Queens, who was resistant to being a poll site. We kind of forced our way in there, and then it's one of our best partnerships. It turned out to

2.2

2.3

be something that they didn't expect, which was a little bit of a lost leader. It got people into the building, especially in the outer boroughs, right? The cultural institutions in Manhattan are well attended and people are aware of them, but some of these other wonderful cultural institutions in the outer boroughs, people don't even know about them, and we got people into the Museum of the Moving Image that would not have even known it existed unless there was a poll site there, and I can tell you that the management and the leadership at that particular museum is very happy with our symbiotic relationship.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Well, we have many dozen, multiple dozens of cultural institutions located in City-owned property, and we should be using our collective influence with those entities to ensure that they're opening up their space so credit to all the folks who have advocated for this and the progress we've made on the cultural institutions.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: And I will concur with you in this regard on that. Those institutions have a tendency to listen to you guys more than they listen to us.

3

4

5

6

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Well, the Council gives them a whole lot of money, and so they certainly should listen to us, or at least Gale.

I want to just shift gears to RCV.

7 135,000 test ballots that were wrongly counted in the

Obviously, we were all kind of embarrassed by the

8 first tabulations of the RCV results in the June '21

10 stage that you're all prepared for correct, accurate,

primary. You know, how confident is the BOE at this

11 | timely accounting of the RCV totals?

not trying to dodge a question, but I was not present during the June 2021 primary. I was out on extended medical leave. I didn't come back until the end of August that year. So, I have kind of an understanding of what happened. There were some test ballots in the system. My limited understanding is that although it caused a little bit of a kerfuffle in the beginning, it was corrected in about an hour, an hour and a half's time so there were remedial actions taken immediately in my absence, and we have done multiple RCV contests, special elections, and another primary after that in 2023 where it wasn't repeated so it seems to me...

2

3

scales.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: At much more modest

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Right. Well, so I would say this respectfully, Mr. Chairman. The size of elections don't make a difference to us if the processes are followed properly, right? It just means that more people voted but, if we take the steps that we're supposed to take, we take the same steps in a little election that we do in a larger election, so the fact that we got through a more modest election that happened to be a primary for some of your Colleagues, they might not think it was so modest if they won, right... (INAUDIBLE)

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: (INAUDIBLE)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: But the point is, it didn't repeat itself.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Right.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: And so when you think about large systems, if something happens on a small scale, it'll happen on a large scale, right, so if you resolve it on the smallest scale and it's systemic, it will not be replicated on a larger scale, right, so that's...

Ū

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I just want to ask about absentee ballots and RCV. You indicated in your back and forth with Council Member Carr that...

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Signature

verification. I just wanted to clarify. The BOE is

now reviewing the absentee ballots in advance. Is

that just on signature verification or are those

ballots, the absentee ballots that are submitted in

advance of election day to the Board...

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Incorporated in the immediate RCV totals that are coming, in the first round of RCV totals that are coming out?

what happens now is the absentee ballots come in and they have to be sorted the way they would have been post-election, and then they have to be reviewed, and then once the envelope is determined to be valid from an external review, it's then opened, the envelope goes one way, the ballot goes the other way, and ultimately all of those ballots get scanned at specific intervals up until, I think, the Friday

1 2 before election day, and then whatever comes in after 3 that is done, but when you see preliminary results on 4 election night, like this past election, when you saw all those large numbers coming in right after 9 5 o'clock, what you were seeing was early voting and 6 7 all of the absentee ballots that were canvassed and scanned timely before election day, and then whatever 8 poll sites closed quickly and got their results in so in that first 10 minutes on election night, you saw a 10 11 big number of ballots come in because it dealt with 12 the 1.1 million early mail ballots and early voting 13 ballots, and then after that, included in that pile

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

absentee ballots.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: That's helpful. Thank you.

were also that data batch, early mail ballots and

I've got a few more items for you, Mike, that I'll try to get through quickly before kicking it over to Council Member Brewer, and then we'll go back to Paul.

Rikers voting. According to the Department of Correction, voting at Rikers Island, I should say, according to the Department of Correction, 1,422 individuals detained completed

2 registration forms or absentee ballot applications,

3 but the BOE only sent 977 absentee ballots to the

4 DOC. Can you help us understand the discrepancy in

5 that data? Essentially, what I think we're seeing is

6 that about a third of the people who are submitting

7 registration and absentee ballot applications are not

8 getting absentee ballots back, I assume because

9 there's some error in what they're submitting.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: So, I could guess, but offline I can get you specific answers to those questions, and I can tell you that we have that information. I just don't have it at my fingertips or off the top of my head.

 $\label{eq:chairperson} \mbox{ CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: We would love a}$ breakdown of that, and when you provide it...

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: But I can guarantee you that every absentee ballot application that we receive is processed. Now, they might not all be valid.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: But what my concern is is that only 977 absentee ballots went to DOC when 1,422 people requested them so a third of the folks who presumably wanted absentee ballots didn't get

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

as that being BOE recruitment efforts. I think that's

25

1

3

Ŭ

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

important. Is the BOE committed to sustaining the outreach efforts that you've recently undertaken to ensure that you are independently bringing poll workers in as much as is needed?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: So, as we have discussed informally, over the course of time since I've been the Executive Director, year after year after year, the number of poll workers that we get from the county organizations has been decreasing so, by necessity, we must commit to our efforts so that we have a sufficient pool of poll workers to conduct elections so, yes, we analyze this information all the time. Increased efforts may differ depending on an election cycle. Like, for example, we don't need as many poll workers for a primary election. We might not need as many poll workers, say, in 2027 when there's no big top of the ticket, no President, no Mayor, no Governor. You'll have sufficiently less numbers of poll workers required because there'll be less poll sites open. But yes, we will always commit to making sure that our poll sites are sufficiently and fully staffed with properly trained individuals.

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I know that there are statutory requirements that you receive referrals from the county party organizations. I've been deeply troubled that some county parties have designated people who are not district leaders to be responsible for referrals of poll workers. I just think the whole thing is a problem and, as much as possible, I think we are better off if the BOE is recruiting people independently, training them. I'd love to look at the data with you on no-show rates, job performance of the folks you are recruiting versus the folks that the county entities are referring. I have a lot more confidence in your recruitment process than in theirs, and I just hope that we sustain the outreach that you've done that I think has been successful moving forward.

The last thing I will raise with you before passing it to Council Member Brewer is about the almost-open General Counsel position, as I believe the General Counsel, currently the BOE, is going to be moving into a judgeship at the end of the month. I do appreciate that it's up to the Board who they hire. I would like to ask, is there a job posting, is there a search that's being conducted

Finance Board. It's just the structure of things.

25

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: But Mr. Paul Ryan is responsible for hiring his staff, promoting his staff, he has control over what's happening, and you're articulating something very different, that the Board is responsible for determining which patronage positions are filled by whom and when.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: Section 3300 of the New York State Election Law sets out the responsibilities, and I supervise the Board under the supervision of the Board of Commissioners.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I understand. I just think it's the most basic of expectations that there should be a job description. There should be core qualifications that we could articulate for what somebody should have to be serving in the absolutely critical role of General Counsel. Who the General Counsel is makes a critical difference on who gets on the ballot, on how and the fairness and the integrity of our elections operations so this is really important, I think, for anyone who cares that our elections are fair and efficient and effective, as I know you do.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: So, I would say this as well. Our Deputy General Counsel is

2 h

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

here today as well. Although they have different titles, General Counsel, Deputy General Counsel, it is a bipartisan effort that leads to these conclusions. Mr. Savino is certainly an able and capable attorney who's been at the Board of Elections for as long as I can remember, certainly since I got here, and he does a good job, but I will say this, and I want to dispel what I think is a notion that needs to be dispelled. What determines who gets on the ballot is the law and the compliance of the candidates with the law and there are open and public hearings with respect to problematic, what we'll call problematic petitions, whether they're challenged or not, and that's what's going to drive the day, and our Board of Commissioners largely are lawyers, and I'm not aware of a circumstance where any of them, lawyer or not, would risk their professional reputations or certainly their professional licenses with respect to establishing a ballot and ballot order.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I hear you, and I'm not trying to malign the integrity of anybody in particular. I do think that there are gray areas in these decisions, and having people of integrity and

1

2

3

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

4 being made appropriately, and this is such an

important position for the election operations of New 5

York City. I truly hope that the Board and the 6

7 Brooklyn Democratic Party leader identify somebody

8 who is capable of serving in this role effectively. I

think that the outgoing General Counsel has done a

good job and I'm very hopeful that we'll have 10

11 somebody of that caliber succeed her.

> EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: So, maybe this will make you feel a little better. The organizational chart, as established by the Commissioners, requires the General Counsel and the Deputy General Counsel to report directly to the Executive Director and the Deputy Executive Director so no one, maybe myself and Mr. Ignizio, if he were here, no one is more concerned about the quality of the General Counsel than myself and Mr. Ignizio because they're the individuals, in addition to the Deputy General Counsel, that we're going to rely on, not only for the regular election work that is more visible to the public, but they also serve as the

General Counsel and Deputy General Counsel for the

agency, and we're an agency like every other agency that has its needs, personnel and otherwise, where the General Counsel is an integral part of the process.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I appreciate that. Hopefully, we will all be satisfied with a future candidate.

Council Member Brewer.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you. Mike

Ryan, one concern is your website talks about last

year, '24 election. When are you going to put up '25?

And I have to say, as somebody like you who pays a

lot of attention to media and to the websites, that

is a hindrance to people trying to figure out what to

do so can you, I can fix it for you if you like.

years, and it's been a number of years where it hasn't, our website was overseen by DoIT. We do handle that internally now. We had a shift to Aquios (phonetic) as a way of dealing with that. I can tell you, we do not have an enormous tech staff.

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: I

understand, but we had an all-hands-on-deck approach and no one on our staff has worked more hours than our MIS staff to get the election certified. Election was certified yesterday.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: We will turn our attention to all of those housekeeping issues between now and the end of the year.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay, we want people to vote. You know what they do. They go to the website. So, I'm requesting that, I understand it'll get changed and I will know what's happening in '25, but I do think that as soon as November 5th was over, I'm just saying you need to switch to '25. It can't wait until certifications, because that has nothing to do with certification. I know people are busy, but you've got to, I mean, get somebody at DoIT, or whatever the hell it's called now, to do it, but you have to have the website up to date.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: We will work on that. Like I said, the Presidential election years present specific volume of challenges.

_

you offer it.

welcome.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I don't care what (INAUDIBLE) saying. Please. Because people, everybody comments, because that makes us feel, when I say us, I mean government, feel that we're not current, that we're like in the Stone Age.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN:

Understood. I appreciate our partnership, Council
Member. I also appreciate your corrective advice when

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you very much, and thank you for the American Museum of Natural History. They were so happy to vote there. They didn't know what to do. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: That particularly was an effort championed by Deputy Executive Director Ignizio.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: We love Ignizio.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: It

worked out very well.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Yes. Thank you very much. It was great. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MICHAEL RYAN: You're

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: We love former

3 Council Members.

Okay. Two more topics for Paul, and then we will relieve this panel but, before that, Jayasri has generously reminded me many times to acknowledge that Jim Gennaro was with us. Thank you for being here, Council Member Gennaro.

Okay. I would like to start, Paul, with a disturbing article I read a week or two ago about an independent expenditure in an individual Council District, and the article, I believe it was in The City, somebody can correct me, I don't want to not give credit after I failed to give credit to Jeff Colton earlier. I believe this article was in The City, and it indicated that one PAC has announced its intent to spend 950,000 dollars, sorry, it was a New York Focus, thank you. Molly knows everything. I just sit here. Thank you, Molly. New York Focus. The PAC announced its intent to spend 950,000 dollars to support one candidate in one local City Council race. Given campaigns, as we all know themselves, are barred from spending more than 414,000 dollars per cycle, is there more that we should be doing to level

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

the playing field with such extreme independent expenditures being planned for the months ahead?

4 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Tiny bit of backstory, but I'll begin with what you already know, 5 I'm certain, which is that large independent 6 7 expenditures have no impact under current law here in 8 New York City on the legal requirements or restrictions applicable to candidates. There's no interaction there. Until 2011, some jurisdictions 10 11 around the country with public financing programs did 12 two things in response to big independent 13 expenditures regarding publicly financed candidates. 14 They gave them more public funds and they increased 15 their spending limits. And then the U.S. Supreme 16 Court got involved in 2011 in a case by the name of 17 Arizona Free Enterprise, the U.S. Supreme Court 18 declared unconstitutional in Arizona law that gave 19 additional public funds to publicly financed

candidates when they were faced by big outside

found that giving additional public funds to a

spending. The court, in my opinion incorrectly, but

nevertheless, they are the Supreme Court majority,

candidate in response to independent spending and/or

high-spending non-participating candidate spending,

1 the trigger in Arizona applied to both, violated the 2 3 constitutional rights of the independent spender. It 4 chilled their rights. So at least since 2011, it has been unconstitutional to give extra money to publicly 5 financed candidates. However, the Supreme Court has 6 7 not ever analyzed the constitutionality of simply 8 increasing the spending limits for publicly financed candidates opposed by big IEs. They didn't really have the occasion to consider that issue separately 10 in the Arizona case because it was a full public 11 12 financing program where any additional public funds 13 was a dollar for dollar increase in the spending limit. So here in New York City, my understanding is 14 15 independent expenditures weren't really on the radar. 16 They weren't much of an issue until about 2013. 17 They've been more of an issue over the past decade or 18 so. In the wake of the Arizona Free Enterprise decision, New York City stopped enforcing one 19 20 relevant or related provision of Law, which up until 21 this Arizona Free Enterprise case in the Supreme 2.2 Court, New York City did give extra public funds, 2.3 bonus public funds to candidates whose nonparticipating opponents spent above certain limits. 24

Stopped doing it. New York City has long had an

25

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

expenditure limit trigger when a candidate's facing a 2 3 non-participating opponent so, if your opponent 4 raises or spends 50 percent of the applicable spending limit, you get a bump, a 50 percent bump in 5 your spending limit as a publicly financed candidate 6 7 and then, if your opponent raises or spends three 8 times the applicable spending limit, the participating candidate is released completely from spending limits. Still get your public funds, no 10 11 spending limit. In 2021, this Committee considered, 12 but the Council did not pass a bill that would have 13 applied to independent expenditures the same policy 14 that presently and has long applied to participating 15 candidates. So, under this bill, I believe Mr. Lander 16 was the principal sponsor of the bill, it would have 17 just applied the same 50 percent and then 300 percent

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: As a foremost expert in this space, do you have a policy recommendation that you think it's worth revisiting that proposed legislation?

trigger to independent expenditures.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: As an individual, I would say, yes, let's certainly have that conversation. On behalf of the Campaign Finance

2.2

2.3

Board, I actually didn't dig into this issue until yesterday or maybe Monday of this week to learn about the history here in New York City. I'm very familiar. I was actually involved with the litigation that went to the Supreme Court on this matter. I think in terms of Constitutional law, applying an increase in spending limits in response to independent spending, I think there are strong defensive arguments for that in court, but certainly happy to kick it around with my team and then come back to you and have a conversation with you about it.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I know that many of my Colleagues are deeply concerned about just the extraordinary influence that big money can have in overwhelming what we're allowed to spend ourselves with the spending caps in place and thinking about ways that we can better level the playing field, either revisiting Council Member Lander, now Comptroller Lander's, legislation or other approaches, I think is important and timely so we look forward to having that conversation with you.

And then I do just want to close out by asking some audit questions. I appreciate very much the plan moving forward for how we will ensure that

2.2

2.3

are outstanding?

most audits are completed in a timely fashion. I did
just want to check on how we're doing so far with the
2021 cycle. Can you share with us of the, I believe
it was 308 candidates that ran in 2021 for whom the
CFB is completing audits of those campaign
committees, how many have been completed? How many

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Let me see.

So, I have a total number of draft audits from 2021,
the total number of campaigns getting a draft audit
is 340 and the total number of draft audits that have
gone out, 329 so 97 percent of the candidates who
will be receiving a draft audit have received it
already. Do you have another data point to in that
question? Did I miss anything?

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: I guess what I'm really asking is how many are completed?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Okay, final audits published, 153 have been published so far.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: So, am I right in the math is that we have 187 that have not been completed?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: I would want to double, let's see, 153, 250. I'm seeing a

2.2

2.3

number in this chart in my prep materials, the number of outstanding final audits, 273, so if 273 plus, and then some campaigns don't get draft audits also, which makes the math a little bit difficult.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Okay.

example, sometimes a campaign goes directly to a final audit, if there's really no problems whatsoever, but the numbers I have in front of me, and I'm happy to follow up with you with confirming all of this data is that, you know, we have issued 329 of 340 draft audits and the number of final audits so far is 153 so 329 minus 153 would be presumably the number you're looking for.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Okay, that's 176. So, in that range, so under any circumstances, a majority of the audits have not been completed.

Recognizing that we have a plan for the future, is there additional resources or support that the CFB, or is there a plan for how we're going to expeditiously complete these outstanding audits?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PAUL RYAN: Yeah, there's, you know, a few facets to the plan. One was reining in the extensions policy, and I've mentioned

1 what the policy is going forward, max six weeks 2 3 extensions. The problem is that we can't apply those 4 new strict limits to campaigns in 2023 or 2021, because some campaigns have gone through the audit process, gotten all the extensions they wanted. There 6 7 would be an equity issue and potentially a legal 8 challenge to us if we were to superimpose those limits but, lacking the ability to put this new sixweek limit, we have reinstated a more generous limit 10 11 policy on audits and enforcement actions in the 12 spring so unlimited extensions are over. We're 13 reining all of this back in. We are working on a more 14 concrete plan called a backlog burndown for 2021 in 15 particular. Although those audits are far enough 16 along that we're now really focused on 2023 as well, making sure we move through 2023 quickly enough that 17 18 it doesn't impact our ability to reach our 2025 goal. 19 That's the challenge that we're working with. We're 20 going to be trying a couple different things. We're 21 going to be, for example, assigning teams to specific 2.2 years to complete the audits and not diverting them. 2.3 For example, in this moment, typically the auditors would be scrutinizing all the information that came 24

in by November 22nd to determine payment eligibility

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for December 16th. Huge task, short timeframe, and the way we've done work planning within our audit team historically has been put all the auditors or almost all the auditors on the urgent time-limited task. We're trying to figure out a better and different approach that will allow us to continue working through some of this backlog instead of start, stop, start, stop on the backlog audits.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Okay. Look, I appreciate the complexity in changing rules midstream and how that could be unfair to certain candidates, and I do appreciate that the irregularity of the twoyear cycle that we're dealing with right now also makes things a little more complicated, but the overarching point is that when we don't have the audit results completed in advance of the upcoming cycle, it provides gaps in information that I think the Board really needs to have in making informed and thoughtful decisions. We went back and forth at probably greater length than you would have liked where we discussed that the Board has the authority to make decisions on withholding funds anyway based on the candidate's role, but I do think this is a really problematic dynamic that unfortunately has

2 bled into the '25 cycle in ways that I really wish

future cycles.

I want to thank you both for your

patience and thoughtfulness in your testimony today,

but more importantly, thank you for your leadership

and your commitment to speed up this process for

had been avoided, and so I appreciate your attention

to this issue, I appreciate your plan moving forward

hard work that you both do and that your teams do,

of both of your agencies. We really appreciate the

and we're grateful for it so thank you both for your

time today.

We are going to go to our second panel, but I'm going to take a bathroom break. I just want to tell you who's coming, and then I'll be back in 60 seconds. Susan Lerner, Marina Pino, and Ben Weinberg will be the next panel, and we'll get started in 90 seconds.

Okay, great. If folks wouldn't mind taking their seats, please, we'll get started. Thank you so much. If you'd like to have conversations, you can do it outside if you don't mind. Thank you so much. We're going to shift gears.

_

Okay. I am now opening the hearing for public testimony. I would like to remind members of the public that this is a formal government proceeding and that decorum shall be observed at all times. As such, members of the public shall remain silent at all times.

The witness table is reserved for people who wish to testify. No video recording or photography is allowed from the witness table.

Further, members of the public may not present audio or video recordings as testimony but may submit transcripts of such recordings to the Sergeant-at-Arms for inclusion in the hearing record.

If you wish to speak at today's hearing, please fill out an appearance card with the Sergeant-at-Arms and wait to be recognized. When recognized, you will have three minutes to speak on today's hearing topics. If you have a written statement or additional written testimony you wish to submit for the record, please provide a copy of that testimony to Sergeant-at-Arms. You may also email written testimony to testimony@counsel.nyc.gov within 72 hours of this hearing. Audio and visual recordings will not be accepted.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

I have called up our first panel, and with that, I'd like to invite Susan Lerner to begin.

SUSAN LERNER: Thank you. Thanks for allowing public testimony and including bills for us to comment on. As you and I have spoken at an earlier hearing, it's great to be able to comment on the specifics of a bill, and I would like to say that it would be helpful in the future if the Council's rules were changed so that we could submit our testimony electronically and not bring 20 copies, especially when in most hearings we're lucky if there are two Council Members to hear our testimony, so I'm killing a lot of trees. But I'd like to focus on our experience as the lead organization for election protection, which is the largest non-partisan election monitoring program in the country, and we trained and placed approximately 400 people in New York City and in selected areas outside of New York City, and the experience of our volunteers and the information that came in through the 1-866-OUR-VOTE hotline allows me to talk about specific repetitive problems. I agree, New York City's elections have gotten a lot better. I want to compliment the Board of Elections on its efforts to professionalize its

staff. Once again, I want to shout out the 15 staff 2 3 members at the Board of Elections who are now 4 certified election administrators. Two years of coursework. This is a major accomplishment and 5 absolutely the direction we want to see the Board go 6 7 in, and so the election was much smoother. We did not see a huge number of long lines, but there are 8 certain problems that are coming up repeatedly. The first one is the poll workers aren't really clued 10 11 into the seriousness of electioneering. In every 12 single cycle where we run election protection, either 13 through the phone or on the field, we receive reports, sometimes just one or two, but that's one or 14 15 two too many, of poll workers who are telling people 16 how to vote, who are literally rejecting ballots, you 17 filled this out wrong, you're a Democrat, you can 18 only vote for Democratic candidates. This happens every single general election, and then we run into 19 20 problems. Sometimes there are poll workers themselves 21 who are electioneering or they aren't enforcing the 2.2 electioneering rules so one of our recommendations is 2.3 that in the training, the process of protecting the impartiality of the election procedures by 24 controlling electioneering should be reemphasized, 25

25

and particularly the politically named poll workers 2 3 have to understand that it is not their job to tell 4 people how to vote so that's an issue that comes up 5 repeatedly. This year we saw a bit more of, but we generally see issues regarding signage, and one of 6 7 our recommendations to the Board is to redesign the 8 signs, and I suggest that the Council might want to 9 actually think about a legal requirement because what we're finding is that the signage, particularly 10 11 outside poll places, is inadequate. There aren't 12 enough of them. They aren't big enough, and going to 13 the question that Councilwoman Hanif brought up, they are often only in English, and particularly we found 14 15 this year in neighborhoods with large numbers of Chinese speakers, they were wandering around trying 16 17 to find the polling place when the signs were in 18 English and not in Chinese so a requirement is that 19 there be bigger, better, more signs, signs not just 20 outside the entrance to the polling place, but 21 throughout the perimeter of a large building because 2.2 people are looking for the door and they're not 2.3 getting directions. Again, problems with disability access, unfortunately, and also the fire alarm 24

problem. We are supporters of a bill that would

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

۵

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

2223

24

25

extend the polling place opening hours for however long a polling place was closed because of an emergency, either real or threatened, so I bring that to your attention.

I want to just very briefly mention two bills that we strongly support. We support all of the bills that are before the Committee today, but two in particular that I wanted to pull out. The first one is the bill that Council Member Menin has introduced, which I quess is Intro. 293, and we think it's a good beginning, but we wonder why the Council Member did not include disclosure requirements. It's one thing to protect the candidates from actual deceptive practices, but it's really voter education that will help the voters be more skeptical in instances where AI is used in a political ad. So, to us, a necessary amendment here would be to include a disclosure whenever an ad utilizes AI and then allow the voter to determine the trustworthiness of the depiction.

The second thing is that we absolutely support and applaud Council Member Brewer for Intro.

565. We think it's way overdue. You know, we've seen incremental improvements in protecting that vulnerable population of people who really should not

2.2

2.3

have their data out available publicly because they have been the recipients of abuse. Our one suggestion is to ensure that the Campaign Finance Board consult with the Board of Elections when it puts together the guidelines. It's one thing to have an overall instructions from the election law, but the question is really what information does the Board need, what are its procedures to be sure that when community organizations are providing data and having people write letters that the information the Board wants is there and that the guidelines comport with the actual practice, not just the overall outlines of the election law.

Lastly, I would like to say for ranked choice voting, the City does not actually use all of its modalities of communication to educate voters.

There are a lot of different ways in which the City communicates with its residents. There are ways to include notifications, website information, and things as simple as tax bills or notifications that go out from different agencies, requiring every single agency to have a connection on its website to have a link to more information about the upcoming elections and RCV and send them to NYCVotes, send

2	them to the information. I want to urge the Campaign
3	Finance Board and all of the City agencies which do
4	voter education to consult now on the information,
5	ensure that the language that is used is uniform and
6	accurate. We ran into a problem in 2021 where the BOE
7	had chosen one Spanish translation, the Campaign
8	Finance Board chose another Spanish translation, and
9	the advocates had to come in and say, hey guys, this
10	is confusing to voters, you're talking about the same
11	thing in different ways so we need to have that
12	coordination happening now before the Campaign
13	Finance Board sets up its materials and then we find
14	out that either communities don't think it's accurate
15	or other agencies are using slightly different terms.
16	Uniformity is the absolute necessary standard for
17	voter education, and I believe we can have another
18	very successful ranked choice voting election in
19	2025. Thank you and thanks for your patience in

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you so much. Susan, do you have preference on who goes next?

Marina, thank you.

letting me go over.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARINO PINO: Great. Good afternoon, Chair Restler and Council Member. My name is Marina Pino.

I'm an attorney at the Brennan Center for Justice, a
non-partisan public policy institute that works to
strengthen our systems of democracy for all. Thank

5 you for the opportunity to testify today.

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

We applaud the Council for calling on lawmakers in Albany to build on its recent works, moving certain local elections to even years by initiating the constitutional amendment process to align city elections too. We strongly support Resolution 189-A before you today. The average voter turnout in New York City Mayoral elections is just 29.5 percent, which is drastically lower than turnout rates in even numbered years as has been underscored earlier in this hearing. Shifting city elections to even years can help address this urgent problem. When city, state, and federal elections are aligned, turnout increases, especially among young voters and voters of color. That's what we've seen in cities that have made the shift, including Los Angeles, Austin, and Baltimore. In fact, research shows that Californian cities that have adopted this policy have seen turnout among younger voters nearly double and substantial gains in turnout among Hispanic and Asian American voters as well. As the Resolution

highlights, a shift to even year elections will also reduce election administration costs. The Independent Budget Office found that New York City stands to save an estimated 42 million dollars every other year. By passing this Resolution, the City Council will make crystal clear it remains committed to giving underrepresented New Yorkers a more meaningful voice in their elections. We urge this Body to advance it without delay.

As for the 2025 election preparations, the Brennan Center commends the City Council for its continued efforts to strengthen New York City's Small Donor Matching Funds Program. For more than 35 years, the voluntary program has served as a necessary counterweight to the power of private wealth in our government and as a nationwide model for reform.

Recent allegations of abuse of the City's program are deeply serious, and if they are proven true, they are an affront to the millions of New York City voters that the system was designed to serve. We commend the City Council and the CFB for their ongoing work to shore up this very important program, and we urge you to remain vigilant in continuing to refine program safeguards with appropriate due process protections

2.2

2.3

Thank you again.

to ensure that under-resourced campaigns are not deterred in their participation. To that end, we support the CFB's recent amendments to its rules, including one that makes the campaign's failure to timely provide requested documents mandatory grounds for non-payment of public funds, with certain reasonable exceptions, again, which has been discussed earlier at this hearing. We also support the Council and the CFB's continued efforts to examine how the law may be further strengthened. As the CFB prepares for next year's election, it must continue to assess its internal practices to both protect the program from misuse and ensure timely or post-election audits, as described in my written

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you so much. Ben.

testimony, which I submitted online. The Brennan

Center stands ready to support all of these efforts.

BEN WEINBERG: Thank you, Chair Restler and Council Member Brewer. My name is Ben. I'm here representing Citizens Union. I'm going to focus my comments on Resolution 189, which is the Even Year Elections Resolution. Now, we submitted a detailed

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

points.

memo with a lot of charts and data and maps so that

will hopefully be a good brief and explanation about

the issue so I'll focus my remarks on a few key

Why is this important now? It was mentioned, and Chair Restler has mentioned, we are seeing turnout that is in decline. With every cycle, we have less and less voters voting. The last Mayoral election saw 23 percent. We'll be lucky if we see 21 percent next year, and next year is an important consequential election. So, we have to do something about it, or we'll end up like one of those 8 percent turnout cities, and those exist around the country. This backdrop has not changed since the Council held this hearing on this last year, or it was the previous Council, but what has changed is that this problem and the solution has been acknowledged and has become clearer. So as was mentioned, the State passed its own law that now requires nearly all local, county, and town elections to hold their local elections in even number of years. That will start in 2026. We now have a Constitutional amendment that has been introduced in the legislature of both houses to move city elections. We have the support of Governor

2.2

2.3

Hochul. We have almost passed last session. We have more experience from more cities that have done this shift. So just to mention a couple of examples. San Francisco just held their first Mayoral election in November, an even year, and turnout went up by almost 40 percent. Las Vegas did the same in this November, and turnout moved from 10 percent to 58 percent, and we have more examples so, you know, we are seeing a trend around the country of cities moving their elections to even number of years with successful results.

Another kind of new development is that we now have more information about voters' preferences. We had two interesting polls that showed that voters are highly supportive of this policy, both statewide, but especially in New York City. In fact, in New York City, we had a poll that showed nearly 3 to 1 approval rate, regardless of age, race, education, and most importantly, party affiliation. We don't have many topics that actually are as popular as this issue among voters of both parties. We have also widespread support from civic groups, voting rights groups, disability rights groups, and a letter of support from 20 groups have been submitted

4

5

6

1

to the Council as well, and we have more information about, as Marina mentioned, how off-cycle elections disproportionately depress voters of color and young voters, and there's also an interesting research submitted by the Election Law Clinic of Harvard Law

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

School.

So, I just want to end by mentioning a few points specific to NYC that I think will also relate to what Chair Restler mentioned earlier and what Mr. Ryan mentioned. First issue of implementation and transition. This relates to what Mr. Ryan mentioned earlier. The only good thing about these odd-year elections being stuck in our State Constitution is that it will take a long time to change it, and that means that this is a long process of a gradual process of implementation and transition. Under the current proposal that is being considered in Albany, the first even year Mayoral election will be in 2032, plenty of time. The bill does not impact incumbents. Most city electeds will be term-limited. So, what does that mean? This gives ample time for voter education, for election officials to prepare, to make sure that the machines receive the paper correctly so that's one thing.

The second thing is about RCV, and you
mentioned that, Mr. Restler, Council Member, and Mr.
Ryan mentioned that as well. A couple of things on
that. So, we already have two pieces of papers, at
least we did have in 2021. We had one piece of paper
with RCV and one piece of paper with other elections.
In fact, we vote on three methods. We vote for DAs
and judges on kind of the regular vote, and we vote
for judges, which is multiple vote, and we vote for
RCV on these odd number of year elections so voters
are already engaged with this kind of process. We
should mention we won't be the first city to do that.
Oakland, San Francisco, Berkeley, and a bunch of
other cities around the country hold RCV elections on
even year elections. They all give out multiple
ballot cards to their voters and, in fact, we looked
at the turnout rate for down ballot races in those
cities, City Council, Board of Supervisors, to see if
there's any difference, and there was no substantial
difference between those elections and the kind of
top of the ticket, and we're actually waiting for the
results from 2024 to publish this data so that's one
thing about ranked choice voting.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I'll end by kind of a general comment on the question of voter education, which Chair Restler mentioned earlier, which we hear that a lot. It's a common concern, and it's a very legitimate concern. So, I see it in two ways. First, there's the number question, which is drop-off. Will we have more voters not making it all the way down the ballot and therefore making this whole reform useless basically? What we see both in other cities and in New York is that the turnout gains we see in even year elections just far, far, far exceed the number of voters that don't make it down the ballot and, just as an example, this November, Proposition 1, down ballot, actually other side of the ballot, the less important race in that election. Turnout for Proposition 1 was 51 percent in the Presidential year. The total turnout, as we heard, was 59 percent for President, and turnout for Mayor in an odd year election was 23 percent so still plenty of more points to go before we get to that threshold that will make this election useless with more ballot drop-off. The other thing about voter knowledge, yes, this will be a more complicated election. We have a couple of studies from California that shows it measured voter

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

knowledge before and after transition in school board elections and show that there was no significant change but, to be honest, those are kind of smallscale elections, but I will say, again, this long process allows us to conduct better voter education, inform voters about this new process, and the fact that we'll see more races on the ballot. And my last point is that this is almost a political philosophical decision we have to make. Do we want to have 20-something percent of voters that are more informed about everyone on the ballot, and I doubt they are actually, or do we want to have three times more voters that are slightly less informed about everyone on the ballot? So, I think as we move forward, our opinion is that we should pick the majority of voters and go with their preferences, which is, whether we like it or not, voting on even years. Thank you, and sorry for going over time.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: No, no, no. I want to just commend the three of you and this panel for your expert testimony, and I am deeply grateful for your thoughtful, consistent, outspoken advocacy for how we strengthen election operations in New York City and protect the integrity of our operations and

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 increase voter turnout so just want to thank you for your work, and thank you for your thoughtful

4 testimony today and your presence here. We really do
5 appreciate it.

I would like to ask a few questions, but I do just want to start with the item I raised earlier with Mr. Ryan from the CFB. You know, I appreciate, Ben, that you kind of lay out the realworld alternative of we could have 23 percent turnout that is moving in the wrong direction in a Mayoral primary or 59 percent... I mean, that was the general election, I quess, so we're comparing a little bit apples and oranges, but even if we did 27 to 59, which was, I believe, the ... or no, 23 was the general. Excuse me, 23 percent was the general. So 23 to 59, so almost a two-and-a-half to one ratio, a little more than that on turnout. Have you looked at other municipalities that have consolidated their municipal, county, and state elections and federal elections in a single voting day and how voters have been able to just manage and process that breadth of information when you think about six municipal elected officials, multiple state elected officials, federal elected officials, ballot questions? It's a

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

lot, and I just wonder how, you know, I'm not ... in an either/or, the choice is clear. I don't know that, you know, I would necessarily agree with the premise that it's one or the other but, if this were to move forward, how do we better engage, inform voters because, you know, we hear all ... every single election, I get, I would say, dozens of frantic emails and texts, and I'm sure the same is true of you and Susan and Marina, everyone, anyone probably in this room, we're all the people who get the dozens of frantic texts of saying, what are all these things on my ballot, who are these judges, what are these ballot questions, who are these people running for State Senate, what is this? Would that issue not be exacerbated by three, five, or ten if this change were to be made? What could we do in concert with this change to try to alleviate that issue?

SUSAN LERNER: I want to talk about my experience in my long exile in California, you know, where the ballots were extremely long, and it contrasted to the experience here in New York, where what we frequently hear from people is, I never know when the election is, there's an election every other month, I don't know what's going on here, and that

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

was a surprise to me so the consolidation goes towards a whole other problem, which is election fatigue, so I would suggest that some of the reasons why we see the low turnout is people are just tired of yet another election, and the antidote is what we already have in our City Charter, thank goodness, which is the only one really in the State, and that is the voter guide. In California, we got a really big voter guide, because we had 14 to 16 initiatives as well as all of the offices but, because we knew when it was coming, people actually engaged with the voter guide, and I feel that people here don't engage as much with the voter guide, because there's just too many elections, this is just another election, and they don't really understand the value of the voter guide. So, I would say expansion of the voter guide, and an emphasis on the voter guide, to look for it, to know it's coming, basic information. The judges are a whole other thing, and that should be its own hearing.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: We can move the judges to odd years, is that it?

BEN WEINBERG: A hearing about abolishing some elected offices. I think you mentioned the, you

2 kind of referenced the answer, you know, we have so 3 many offices on the ballot today, sometimes, we 4 sometimes have 10 or 12 offices on a primary ballot, if you include the party offices. We all get these phone calls, but that's not the only way that New 6 7 Yorkers learn how to vote. They use endorsement lists, they use the voter guide, they use media, they 8 use a whole host of, they use friends. They will continue to do the same, whether we have, so if now 10 11 we have 10, we might have 15, so we'll have to face 12 that, and we'll have to strengthen those mechanisms. 13 Some of them are informal, and some of them are formal that we can spend more money on. We'll be 14 15 saving a lot of money, as Marina has mentioned, and 16 we can take some of that money to improve our voter 17 education. But, yes, this is something we thought 18 about a lot. We have a whole chapter in our report about voter education. Again, if we're talking about 19 20 2032, I think, we can plan ahead and have a good, we 21 can revise our whole voter education system to fit 2.2 this new process. What encourages me is that we won't 2.3 be the first ones to do that. As Susan mentioned, California is kind of the lead on this one, and 24 25 essentially the entire state has moved to even years,

1

and they have, unfortunately for them, way more 2

ballot questions than us. So, if all these cities and 3

4 all these states have done this smoothly, and while

I'm sure New York can do that as well.

SUSAN LERNER: I forgot to mention Puerto 6

7 Rico. Puerto Rico has one election every four years,

and it's a party. They have a huge turnout because 8

it's a big deal. They don't have elections every

other day. 10

11 MARINO PINO: And if I may, just briefly,

12 I think it's equally plausible that voter knowledge

13 can increase.

14 CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Got the button on?

15 MARINO PINO: Oh, is it not working?

16 CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Oh no, there you go.

17 MARINO PINO: Okay, sorry about that. I

18 think it's equally plausible, too, that voter

19 knowledge can increase when these local races are

shifted to even years. There will be more attention 20

on these already higher profile races. That is 21

2.2 something else to think about, and it's not just

2.3 reaching more voters. It's also a more representative

electorate so these are voters that are all tuning in 24

25 at the same time when there's already a ton of

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

25

information, a ton of attention being shed on these issues. These local issues can now get the attention that they really deserve.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Yeah, I think those are all good and fair points.

Just a couple other things for me, and then if Council Member Brewer, do you have any questions for this panel?

No, okay.

I really appreciated your point, Susan, about poll worker training on electioneering. As somebody who has campaigned (INAUDIBLE) of poll sites for probably 20 years, it's like every poll site worker understands the rules differently, and I try my best to educate people about what the rules are and what the law says and what's permitted and what's not permitted, but they may or may not trust me, and I'm not the source they should be getting the information from when I'm out there electioneering myself so I couldn't agree with you more. It's really important, and most notably in your example of when poll site workers are guiding voters on what they should be doing, which we used to hear lots of stories in the Vito Lopez era of translators that he

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 had placed at certain poll sites that would go into 3 voting booths with people. I don't think that it's

4 things that are quite that malicious and organized,

5 but it's problematic all the same, and I really

6 appreciate you highlighting it. I think it's a really

important issue and appreciated each of your support

on the various bills and resolutions.

I did want to ask one question. I think of Susan, but welcome any of your responses. Some of the sharp election attorneys that we've spoken to about what they're anticipating may happen with matching fund disbursement decisions relating to Mayor Adams later this month are that the CFB may withhold 5 percent of public funds to the Adams' campaign, I think what would be a slap on the wrist, despite the federal indictment and multiple years of non-responsiveness and troubling practices. Do you have any expectation of where this is going? If we were to see just a withholding of mere 5 percent of matching funds, what kind of message do you think that would send?

SUSAN LERNER: Well, I'm completing my analysis and will be sending the CFB a letter. There are sort of two ways. One, right now we are at a

1 point where the public has little faith in the 2 3 accountability of elected officials. There's a great 4 deal of cynicism and a sense that corruption is pervasive, and there also is a sense that our institutions cannot protect themselves as we see at 6 7 the federal level repeatedly and as unfortunately I 8 think we will experience over the next four years, 9 and so a very rigid interpretation of the commas as opposed to a sense of the policy behind the law and 10 11 the message that it sends to the public is something 12 which I hope the Campaign Finance Board keeps in 13 mind. This particular, when you have a high-profile executive, they should be, frankly, probably held to 14 15 a higher standard of compliance, not a lower standard 16 of compliance because it sets the tone for every 17 single office, and there is a responsibility, I 18 believe, which citywide candidates have, which is 19 really significant in terms of the message that it 20 sends to the public so I'm hopeful that the CFB does a careful analysis but also keeps in mind the 21 2.2 specific requirements of protecting the system, 2.3 rather than simply looking at a very narrow view of, you know, well, there was 23 dollars here and 15 24

dollars there. We have a quantum, I believe, of

25

2.2

2.3

conduct which requires a pretty vigorous response,

but I have no insight into what the Board is likely

to do.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Fair. We'll all be watching closely on, I think, December 16th at 10 a.m.

I just want to say in closing, really do look forward to working with all three of your organizations in support of Council Member Ung's Resolution 189 to shift elections to even years, but I also hope we can work together in crafting strategies for how we can better inform voters and start to implement some of those policies now, far in advance of a, hopefully, 2032 implementation. With that, I want to thank you for your testimony and your time today, and hope you all have a wonderful evening.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: One way would be to fix the website.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Gail, I thought you were already charged with fixing it yourself. All right.

We are going to shift gears to the next panel. Thank you so much. Our next panel, and forgive

2.3

the Crime Victims Treatment Center, Claire

Stottlemyre for Vote in NYC Jails Coalition, and

Orlando Ovalles from NALEO Educational Fund, and the

fourth person is Cormac Slade Byrd if Cormac Slade

Byrd is still here. Great. Oh, and Cormac Slade Byrd

anybody whose name I mispronounce, Janine Guzzon from

Thank you all. You can testify in whichever order you prefer.

is a constituent, so that's great.

JANINE GUZZON: Good afternoon, Committee
Chair Restler and Members of the Governmental
Operations, State and Federal Legislation Committee.
My name is Janine Guzzon, and I am the Senior
Development Manager at the Crime Victims Treatment
Center. I appreciate this opportunity to speak today
to request your support of 565, sponsored by Council
Member Brewer.

The Crime Victims Treatment Center has provided healing services to victims of interpersonal violence completely free of charge since 1977, and we've been at the forefront of this work since our inception. Our services include crisis intervention in emergency departments across Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Queens, individual and group trauma-focused

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Justice Centers.

therapy, legal advocacy, complementary therapy, and psychiatric consultation at our offices in the Financial District, and sexual assault and domestic violence prevention training and community education in all five boroughs. We've worked with tens of thousands of domestic violence survivors for nearly 50 years and counting. This bill is critical for survivors of domestic violence as it provides them with guidance on making their voter registration records confidential. While Governor Hochul has made it easier for survivors to secure this confidentiality, many are still unaware of these resources and the steps necessary to secure their voting privacy. This crucial bill will bridge the gap by providing vital information and assistance to individuals receiving services at FJCs, Family

Survivors of domestic violence experience a loss of agency, freedom, and independence across many areas of their lives. This can be physical, emotional, financial, educational, medical, or religious. We hear these concerns from many of our clients and work alongside them to restore control and autonomy however we safely can. With regards to

this bill specifically, survivors may feel that they

can't freely and safely exercise their right to vote

or feel pressure to vote the way their abuser wants

them to, even if it goes against their beliefs. The

hinders survivors from participating in democracy. By

signing onto this legislation, the City Council can

play a pivotal role in ensuring these survivors can

vote without compromising their personal safety.

Local elections are particularly impactful for our

clients, so this is more timely than ever with the

fear of their abuser discovering how they voted

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

2.3

24

CBTC has been a consistent and trusted advocate for laws and services that protect and improve the lives of domestic violence survivors.

Defending voting rights and making voting more accessible are concrete ways to restore choice and

appreciate your time and consideration. It is vital that we protect the privacy and safety of those who

need it most. Thank you for your service to the

power to people from whom it has been stripped. I

people of New York City.

upcoming 2025 elections.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you so much.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CORMAC SLADE BYRD: Good afternoon. My name is Cormac Slade Byrd, and I'm a civically engaged New Yorker who believes deeply in the power of democratic participation. I'm here today to urge this Committee to vote yes on Resolution 189 in support of even-year elections. There isn't a strong justification for maintaining odd-year elections. In fact, odd-year elections are only the status quo because of political maneuvering during the 1894 State Constitutional Convention. Before that, city elections shifted between odd and even years in 1870, 1857, and 1850. If it could happen four times in a 50-year period, we can certainly do it now. The voter turnout arguments for even-year elections are undeniable. Higher and more representative turnout is practically guaranteed. I'm sure you've heard and will continue to hear these points, but they bear repeating. This is the lowest-hanging fruit to improve civic engagement in local politics.

On a practical level, odd-year elections are inefficient and costly. They require separate administrative resources, public education campaigns, and auditing processes, all of which could be consolidated into existing even-year cycles. Moving

3

1

4

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

ORLANDO OVALLES: Good afternoon,

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you so much.

everyone. I'm Orlando Ovalles with NALEO Educational

elections to even years would save millions of dollars, improve efficiency, and allow the Board of Elections to focus on delivering better services.

I want to highlight an important point of

urgency. This same Resolution was considered in June 2023 but was never brought to a vote. A year and a half later, the arguments remain as strong as ever. Delaying action comes at a cost, another cycle of low-turnout elections and lost time. Even if this resolution passes, the State Legislator must amend Article 8, Section 8 of the State Constitution, across two consecutive Legislatures, a process that takes at least three years. Add to that the time required to implement these changes, and it's clear that every delay prolongs this subpar equilibrium we find ourselves in today. This is a crucial step towards a democracy that invites broader participation from our City's residents. Let's take that step together. Thank you to Chair Restler and the Committee on Governmental Operations, State and Federal Legislation.

1 Fund, serving as Northeast Director of Civic 2 3 Engagement. Chair Restler and Members of the 4 Committee, Council Members, thank you for the opportunity to provide this testimony on behalf of 5 the National Association of Latino Elected and 6 7 Appointed Officials, NALEO Educational Fund. We urge 8 the City Council to pass three measures that will greatly enhance the participation of Latinos and other underrepresented groups in New York City's 10 11 electoral process. Introduction 441, which will 12 improve young New Yorkers' access to voter 13 registration materials; Resolution 0322, which will 14 promote the passage of legislation requiring Queens 15 Board of Elections to provide language assistance in certain Asian-Indian languages; and Resolution 0189, 16 17 which will promote the enactment of a measure to 18 consolidate New York City's municipal elections with 19 the state's even-year gubernatorial elections. We 20 also offer recommendations on how the New York State 21 and municipal agencies must work closely with 2.2 stakeholders to ensure the sound implementation of 2.3 the consolidation of elections envisioned in Resolution 0189. NALEO Educational Fund is the 24

leading non-for-profit, non-partisan organization

25

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the testimony.

that facilitates full Latino participation in the American political process from citizenship to public service. Our constituency encompasses the more than 7,000 Latino elected and appointed officials nationwide, among which more than 90 are from New York City, and it includes Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. For several decades, NALEO Educational Fund has been at the forefront of efforts to increase Latino civic engagement and to empower the Latino community to participate in the American democratic process. NALEO Educational Fund New York City office, which was established nearly 30 years ago, has been a leader in conducting robust, nonpartisan efforts to mobilize Latinos to register to vote and cast ballots, to assist eligible lawful permanent residents with U.S. citizenship process, and to encourage Latinos to participate in the decennial census. You have our recommendations on Introduction 441, Resolution 0322, and in the testimony that you have copies for, in the full version of the testimony. This is just a summary of

Now, I want to speak a little bit about Resolution 0189. For many decades, New York City has

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

166

seen persistently low voter turnout in municipal elections. Despite the critical voting reforms enacted by the New York State legislature, including early voting, automatic and online voter registration, shortening voter registration deadlines, and improving absentee voting, these measures have yet to translate into higher turnout rates in municipal elections, especially for Latinos and other underrepresented groups. This situation has serious implications for our city's governance and policymaking, since low voter turnout indicates that many New Yorkers have not been able to make their voices heard in the state's democracy or elect candidates that are accountable to their concerns. Given the available data on voter turnout rates in New York State, academic research, as well as anecdotal evidence from U.S. jurisdictions who have changed their local election days, we believe that moving New York City's elections to even number years to coincide with gubernatorial elections can be an effective strategy to help ensure higher turnout for Latinos and other underrepresented groups. Ultimately, this will result in a more vibrant

democracy and a more responsive government for all

New Yorkers. If properly implemented, changing the timing of local elections is an approach that can

4 strengthen New York City's democracy by increasing

5 the voter turnout rate of Latino voters and other

6 underrepresented groups as well as ensuring that

7 public officials are accountable to a more

8 representative electorate. For these reasons, we urge

9 the New York City Council to support Resolution 0189.

10 | Thank you for your attention to these important

11 matters. Thank you, Chair Restler and the rest of the

12 | Council Members on this Committee.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you so much,

14 Mr. Ovalles. Next up, Claire Stottlemyre.

15 CLAIRE STOTTLEMYER: Thank you, Chair

16 Restler and Council Member Brewer, for the

17 popportunity to testify before you today. Thank you

19 York City jails as well. My name is Claire

20 | Stottlemyre. I work at the Legal Aid Society and I'm

21 a member of the Vote in New York City Jails

22 | Coalition, which is composed of directly impacted New

23 Yorkers, legal service providers, civic engagement

24 \parallel groups, elected officials that was created in 2020 to

13

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

address the unmet needs of eligible voters who are detained in New York's jails.

In New York, anyone who is detained while serving a misdemeanor conviction or because they cannot afford their bail is eligible to vote. On Rikers Island, as of December 3rd, that is at least 5,924 individuals who retain that right. There are no voting sites in New York City jails, and therefore detained New Yorkers who wish to vote are at the mercy of the Department of Correction each election day. Accordingly, the majority of New Yorkers detained on Rikers Island who regularly have their rights violated, their voices silenced, and their humanity denied to them by this agency and its actors also have their fundamental right to vote taken from them. Our Coalition provides New Yorkers at Rikers Island vital education and necessary paperwork for absentee ballot requests. The Coalition also advocates with lawmakers and City agencies to improve the voting process for detained New Yorkers, including calling for a polling site within the jail. Our experience working with eligible voters at Rikers Island has revealed the systemic failures of both the Board of Elections and the Department of Corrections

1 2 to provide true access to the ballot under the 3 absentee ballot framework. The timeframes prescribed 4 for an absentee ballot naturally excludes people entering detention facilities close to an election 5 day, while logistical impediments out of a detained 6 7 person's control routinely prevent them from 8 accessing the necessary forms. For those who successfully request those forms, many still face barriers to having their vote counted. As a result of 10 11 the many steps involved and inadequate resources 12 provided, voters at Rikers are frequently denied 13 their right to vote. When absentee ballots are delivered to the BOE, they may still be rejected, and 14 15 voters are not provided an explanation or opportunity 16 to cure. The figures from this past election cycle 17 are detailed in our written submission, but briefly 18 for November, the Department of Corrections submitted 19 1,422 requests for absentee ballots, but received 20 just 977 back from the BOE. Accordingly, up to 445 21 incarcerated voters who requested absentee ballots 2.2 may have been wrongfully denied their opportunity to 2.3 vote. Of the 977 ballots that DOC did receive, the DOC returned 598 to the BOE, an additional loss of 24

379 voters. It is unknown to us how many of the 598

25

2 ballots were ultimately counted by the BOE this

1

3 November. It is also our understanding from the

4 Department of Corrections that zero voters detained

5 at Rikers were given the opportunity to cure their

6 ballot. While both agencies pass responsibility off

7 to the other, the impact upon communities of color

8 | who are detained is devastating. 92 percent of

9 individuals currently detained in New York City jails

10 are nonwhite. If we truly care about fair and free

11 | elections and full participation in the democratic

12 process, we must ensure equal ballot access for New

13 Yorkers who are in our jails, most of whom are

14 | awaiting trial and are cloaked in the presumption of

15 innocence.

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

The absentee ballot voting system will always leave detained voters behind, and one person disenfranchised is still too many. New York City should join the other counties throughout the country to provide polling sites in our jails, and we should also strengthen the absentee ballot process by requiring that the BOE and the Campaign Finance Board facilitate the voting program, ensuring voters have direct access to the agency responsible, including

their registration forms, education materials, and

2.

2.2

absentee ballot requests. New Yorkers who are detained in jails must be given the same opportunity to cure their ballots as those who are not, and it is the responsibility of the Board of Elections to ensure that each voter's voice is heard. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you so much to Orlando, Claire, Janine, and Cormac for your thoughtful testimony to protect the confidentiality and privacy and safety of survivors of domestic violence, to increase voter turnout effectively, and to ensure that detainees in New York City, overwhelmingly people who have not been convicted of any crime, have their constitutionally protected right to vote. We really appreciate you being here, your thoughtful advocacy, and I certainly appreciate anyone who's able to reference New York developments that predate when Brooklyn became a part of New York City in their testimony, but really, it's welcomed and appreciated. We value your participation.

Council Member Brewer, anything you'd like to add?

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you. In terms of Rikers, do Legal Aid attorneys, are you also in agreement that we'd have to change the state law

3

2

1

or something in order to get a polling site there because that seems to be what I'm running against.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

CLAIRE STOTTLEMYER: We are not in agreement. We're aware of no such law that says that the law would need to be changed to get a polling site. We think that the law says that they are required to provide absentee ballot voting, but we see that the absentee ballot voting system fails, so we think that a polling site is required in order to not fail those voters. I thought it was interesting today that Executive Director Ryan didn't say that the law doesn't allow it, but that their interpretation is that the law only requires the

16

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Keep working on it.

absentee ballot process.

17 18

CLAIRE STOTTLEMYER: We will.

19

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you very

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you so much

20

21

much.

2.2

2.3

24

25

Before we go to our final panel online, I just wanted to take a moment, a point of privilege, to just recognize the long-time Chair and ranking

for your testimony. We greatly appreciate it.

1

Member of the Judiciary Committee, Jerry Nadler, who

3 has served our City, State, and Country with

4 exceptional distinction. He first ran for office to

be a District Leader, I don't know, 50 years ago,

over 50 years ago, and when I was first running for 6

7 District Leader, you know, said to me, you know,

8 being District Leader is about being a community

leader, but we need people with integrity who are

cleaning up machine politics in New York City and 10

11 just one of the people who I've had the utmost

12 respect for over many, many years, and we've been

13 fortunate to have him in a key leadership role in

Congress for a very long time, and I think he made a 14

15 difficult decision today to drop out of the Judiciary

16 Committee race, but we are grateful for his service

17 and leadership.

18 With that, I would like to invite online,

if the Sergeant-at-Arms can help us figure this all 19

out, Ms. Raquel Bates, Ms. Kathleen Collins, and Mr. 20

21 Christopher Leon Johnson to testify. You'll each have

2.2 three minutes to testify and share your thoughts. We

2.3 can begin with Ms. Bates at her convenience.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Time starts now.

24

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

12

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

RAOUEL BATES: Good afternoon. Can everyone hear me clearly? I just want to make sure.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: We can hear you clearly.

RAQUEL BATES: Great. My name is Raquel

Bates. I'm the Executive Director of the Voices of Women Organizing Project, also known as VOW, and so thank you for the opportunity to testify today. VOW was made up of community organizers who are survivors of domestic violence and child witnesses to domestic violence. We organized to reform domestic violence policy, its implementation, and the services survivors turn to for safety, justice, and assistance. We strongly support Intro. 565, sponsored by Council Member Brewer, to amend the New York City Charter in relation to providing survivors of domestic violence with guidance on making voter registration records confidential and voting by special ballot. Before the election, we worked hard to raise awareness amongst survivors about their options to keep their voter registration records confidential and to vote by special ballot. We found that many survivors did not know their voter registration records were public information, and

1 that alone was a deeply concerning public safety 2 issue. Furthermore, survivors did not know that they 3 4 could keep their voter registration records confidential or vote by special ballot. For 5 survivors, particularly those with high privacy and 6 7 safety risks, this can be the difference between life 8 and death. Providing more education and information about how survivors can keep their voter registration records confidential is critical for their safety and 10 11 well-being. This is why Intro. 565 is vitally 12 important. Survivors need to know their options in an 13 informative way, and it has to make sense and lessen systems navigation. We also believe that NGBV and the 14 15 Board of Elections should work together to develop outreach strategies that speak directly to the 16 17 community, to New Yorkers. Not all survivors seek 18 assistance from the Family Justice Centers or receive services from City agencies or departments. Yet the 19 20 threat of physical and emotional abuse can affect any 21 survivor and their children at any time. We also encourage messaging to let survivors know that 2.2 2.3 confidential voter registration is not indefinite. It is for four years, and the steps they can take to 24

keep their voter registration confidential if they

25

feel unsafe. VOW is ready to assist in developing such outreach strategies. Thank you for your time, and again, the Voices of Women Organizing Project fully supports Intro. 565.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Thank you so much,
Ms. Bates. Really appreciate your thoughtful
testimony.

We'll now go to Ms. Kathleen Collins.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Time starts now.

KATHLEEN COLLINS: My name is Kathleen Collins, and I am a New Yorker who is a congenital quadruple amputee who uses a wheelchair. I am a Co-Coordinator at Downstate New York ADAPT and a member of the Greater New York Council of the Blind, grassroots civil rights organizations run by and for people with disabilities.

With respect to Intro. 441, we support this legislation, but would like certain tweaks to be made to it so that students with disabilities' needs will also be met.

We support Intro. 565, since many in the disability community experience domestic violence.

Here, too, we would like it to be amended so that the needs of survivors of domestic violence who are

disabled are met as well as the needs of survivors of domestic violence whose first language is not English

4 are met, too.

2.2

2.3

With respect to Resolution Number 0322, we support this Resolution, but request that the City Council propose to the New York State Legislature that this proposed bill also require that materials not only be provided in a print format, but also be available in other formats that are accessible to New Yorkers with disabilities who speak Bengali, Punjabi, and Hindi.

With respect to Resolution Number 189-A, we fully support this Resolution, which calls on the New York State Legislature to pass and voters to approve an amendment to the New York State

Constitution to move New York City elections to even number years to coincide with the federal elections.

This is very important to voters with disabilities, because it is only during federal elections that the protections provided by the Help America Vote Act of 2002, also known as HAVA, apply.

We will be providing more detailed written testimony within the next three days on what we just spoke about.

2.2

2.3

Also, I'd just like to mention one other thing. We support getting voters who are incarcerated the right to vote, and we are just a little concerned because it talks about absentee ballots, and we want those ballots to also be in an accessible format, such as having a ballot marking device available for those who are incarcerated who are disabled so that they can vote and not have to use a paper ballot so that's something that I think we need to work on.

Thank you again for your time and your attention. I really appreciate it, and we'll be sending you further written testimony in the next few days. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Ms. Collins, thank you so much for your thoughtful testimony. We really, really appreciate it and appreciate the suggestions for how we can make 441 a smarter bill to better serve all young adults and ensure that they have access to easily enroll to vote.

Last but not least, we will hear from Mr. Christopher Leon Johnson as the final person testifying today.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Time starts now. Time starts now.

CHAIRPERSON RESTLER: Mr. Leon Johnson, we're unable to hear you at this time. If we can't, we'll give you another few seconds, but feel free to submit written testimony if you prefer. We're sorry for the technical difficulty. Oh, we lost you.

Okay. Well, with that, we want to thank everybody for joining us today. I will adjourn the hearing and look forward to reconvening the Gov Ops Committee in March. Thank you so much. [GAVEL]

${\tt C} \ {\tt E} \ {\tt R} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt F} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt C} \ {\tt A} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt E}$

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date December 11, 2024