STATE OF HAWAII
ELECTIONS COMMISSION

MINUTES

WILLIAM B. MARSTON
ELECTIONS COMMISSION CHAIR

REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ELECTIONS COMMISSION

MAY 18, 2015 @ 10:00 AM
KAKUHIHEWA STATE OFFICE BUILDING
601 KAMOKILA BLVD., ROOM 167B
KAPOLEI, HAWAII 96707

MAUI	BIG ISLAND	KAUAI
Wailuku State Office Building 54 So. High Street, 3rd Fl. Wailuku, Hawaii 96793	Hilo State Office Building 75 Aupuni Street, Basement Hilo, Hawaii 96720	Lihue State Office Building 3060 Eiwa Street, Basement Lihue, Hawaii 96766

Commissioners in Attendance:

Mr. William Marston, Chair
Ms. Patricia Berg
Mr. Charles King
Ms. Carol Kitaoka
Ms. Ruth Limtiaco
Ms. Terry Lynn Moore
Mr. Warren Orikasa
Mr. Victor Vierra
Mr. Danny Young

Technical Support Staff in Attendance:

Ms. Valri Kunimoto, Department of the Attorney General
Mr. Scott Nago, Chief Election Officer
Ms. Ruthie Ah Hee, Office of Elections
Ms. Nedielyn Bueno, Office of Elections – Lihue State Office Building
Ms. Judy Gold, Office of Elections
Ms. Pat Nakamoto – County of Hawaii – Hilo State Office Building
Ms. Dana Nakooka – County of Maui – Wailuku State Office Building
Mr. Josiah Nishita – County of Maui – Wailuku State Office Building
Mr. Rex Quidilla, Office of Elections
Mr. David Rosenbrock, Office of Elections
Mr. Rhowell Ruiz, Office of Elections

Ms. Cori Saiki – County of Hawaii – Hilo State Office Building
Mr. Aaron Schulaner, Office of Elections
Ms. Aulii Tenn, Office of Elections
Ms. Jamee-Lee Toro-Lopes, Office of Elections
Ms. Kristen Uyeda, Office of Elections
Mr. Chris Wong, Office of Elections

Guests in Attendance – Kakuhihewa State Office Building:

Mr. Tine Howard – Hawaii News Now
Mr. Jeff Kuwada – Wailuku State Office Building
Mr. Stewart Maeda, Hawaii County Clerk – Hilo State Office Building
Ms. Nina Magoun – County of Kauai – Lihue State Office Building
Mr. Danny Mateo, County of Maui
Mr. Jim Mendoza – Hawaii News Now
Ms. Cindy Vaillancourt
Ms. Valentyna Vizir
Mr. Lyndon Yoshioka, County of Kauai

PROCEEDINGS

I. Call to Order

Chair Marston called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. on May 18, 2015 at the Kakuhihewa State Office Building, Room 167B.

II. Roll Call and Determination of a Quorum

Elections Commission Secretary conducted roll call. All Commissioners were in attendance.

III. Approval of Minutes for the meeting of April 7, 2015

As there were no additions or corrections to the minutes, Commissioner King moved that the minutes be approved, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Orikasa and approved unanimously by the Commissioners.

IV. Public Testimony – Any interested person may submit comments or testimony on any agenda item

a. County of Kauai – Ms. Bueno informed no one available to testify.

b. County of Maui – Mr. Nishita informed no one available to testify.

c. County of Hawaii – Ms. Saiki informed no one available to testify.

d. City and County of Honolulu – No one available to testify.

V. Status of Operations Report from the Chief Election Officer, discussion and action, if appropriate

Chief Election Officer (CEO) Nago reported that since the last meeting, the Office of Elections (OE) has focused on legislation, online voter registration and revising the website. CEO Nago commented he will discuss legislation last, as it is an agenda item.

CEO Nago reported that OE completed the testing of the online voter registration. Starting in August, any qualified resident with a Hawaii Driver's License or State Identification can register online. The enabling legislation was enacted by the legislature in 2012 and the system will go live for the 2016 Elections. In August 2015, individuals can start registering to vote online.

CEO Nago reported OE is in the testing phase and determining what the best practices are for the adoption to the new statewide voter registration system. This is Phase II of the online voter registration; OE will migrate the voter registration system to the new system.

With reference to revising the OE website, CEO Nago reported that OE is set to go online soon. This will conform the OE website to the format or template used by all departments in the state.

With reference to legislation, there were two bills that passed this session and are awaiting approval from the Governor. The Governor has until July 14, 2015 to approve or veto bills.

- House Bill No. 179 relates to permanent absentee ballots. This bill requires the forwarding address for permanent absentee ballots to be the in-state mailing address in the voter's registration record. If someone is on vacation, or in college, they can utilize the seasonal absentee ballot application. This does not prevent them from voting absentee but the ballots will not automatically be sent to out-of-state addresses.

- Commissioner King inquired about APO addresses, and CEO Nago explained APO addresses are a different matter as federal requirements treat military overseas voters differently. Instead of having to request a ballot for every election and remembering to request a ballot, if a voter signs up for a permanent absentee ballot, one will automatically be mailed to the voter. The only difference is that the ballot will not be mailed to an out-of-state address.

- Senate Bill No. 440 relates to vacancy elections for the office of the U.S. Senator, and amends the candidate filing deadline. This was prompted by a recommendation by the U.S. Department of Justice to meet the 45-day overseas ballot requirement.

- House Bill No. 500, is the budget bill, OE did not get the money requested for voter education. OE will use federal funds for voter education.

Commissioner Orikasa referenced CEO Nago's report that the OE website will work with all other state web sites and asked if this was developed by OIMT. CEO Nago responded that previously, state agencies developed their own website and they all looked different. He did not recall when the mandate was issued to make state agencies' websites look similar and to have the same feel, but OE has been working on the website. Commissioner Orikasa verified that given the public input over the last few years, CEO Nago should strive to have the website become more easily maneuvered so the public can get information in an expeditious manner. CEO Nago replied that OE has noticed that members of the public are going to the website rather than calling the office for information. As a result, there are less calls coming into the office. So, OE has included more information on the website to make it more convenient for the public to access the information even after hours.

Commissioner Moore asked CEO Nago if he was given a reason as to why the budget request for voter education was not approved. CEO Nago explained OE has not received funds for voter education for years. OE has federal funds that can be, and has been, expended for that purpose, so that could be one of the reasons, but OE was not provided a reason for the denial of the budget request. The Legislature will not fund the voter education, if federal funds are available for that purpose. Commissioner Moore asked how much had been requested; CEO Nago advised $143,000. Commissioner Moore asked what amount was available in federal funds. CEO Nago advised OE has federal funds to cover voter education for a few elections, but it will not be replenished. CEO Nago explained the reason we asked for funding this year is to inform the legislature that once the federal funds run out, voter education will need to be funded by the legislature.

Commissioner Limtiaco asked what amount is available in federal funds going forward. CEO Nago advised there was approximately $6 million, some of which will be used for the new Voter Registration System. CEO Nago informed OE has funds to cover voter education for two to three election cycles.
Commissioner Moore asked, when OE make these requests, is it essentially the same way OE has made the request in the past, or has the request been made in a different manner, or in a different way each year, in hopes of getting a different response. CEO Nago explained that when a budget request is made, OE provides a justification for the request which OE may modify to get the best

result. The request goes to the Department of Accounting and General Services (DAGS), then it goes to Budget and Finance (B&F). As far as the justification, OE tries to improve on it so there is a better chance of obtaining funding.

Commissioner Berg inquired about the all mail voting bill for Kauai (SB No. 287) that was not sent to the Governor for his signature, and asked if there is a possibility that the bill may come up again. CEO Nago noted that the bill did not pass out of the Conference Committee, and since this is the first year of the legislative biennium, all bills that did not pass this year, is still alive and could possibly come up in Conference again in the next session. Commissioner Berg questioned the timing of it if it does come up again. Will it be too late to conduct the Primary by mail, or would it be effective in the General Election. CEO Nago explained that the Governor has until July 14, this year, to approve or veto bills, and it would be around the same time next year to approve or veto bills. So we would not know until the middle of July 2016. With an August Primary, it would not be prudent to have an all mail election in 2016. Commissioner Berg commented that that was good, as she was not a proponent of conducting all mail in the 2016 Primary Election because there were a lot of loose ends.

Commissioner Berg also requested that sometime between now and then, she would like to see some procedures be put in place with respect to the signature authorization process. She commented a number of individuals have mentioned it, including those who testified, not only Commissioners, and we need to nail down the process and get something more specific on what happens to those ballots that are set aside. CEO Nago acknowledged her request.

Commissioner Orikasa stated he found it curious, that while elected officials decried the fact that voter turnout percentage had gone down, they did not approve a bill that would enhance our opportunity to increase that percentage. He commented it was counter-intuitive.

Commissioner Kitaoka inquired if OE is still working with the schools as part of the voter education program. CEO Nago informed the process has already started; request letters were mailed a couple of months ago to all of the schools. Commissioner Kitaoka asked if OE is conducting the program similar to how it was done last time around. CEO Nago confirmed the process is the same, a request is mailed to the school, if they indicate they want to participate, OE supplies the materials to provide to the students.

Commissioner Kitaoka indicated she's aware that the Department of Education (DOE) and the Hawaii State Bar Association's Civic Education Committee will again be doing voter education more widespread than previously done, and asked if OE is willing to work with her on that too. CEO Nago acknowledged her request and asked Commissioner Kitaoka to let him know what they need. CEO Nago commented he recalls a couple of years ago, the DOE tried to get voter

education in the curriculum but it did not happen. Commissioner Kitaoka stated she was not sure how they are going to proceed but since next year is an election year, they will try to start earlier in the year.

Commissioner King inquired if OE only approaches the DOE, or has the University of Hawaii (UH) been contacted. CEO Nago responded OE also approaches private schools, and advised he believes the colleges are required to have the forms available, as they receive the funds. OE general counsel Aaron Schulaner confirmed colleges receive federal funds and registration materials related to enrolling at UH. Commissioner King asked if there's a way to push a little more instead of just having a form for Registration, as they are eligible to vote.

CEO Nago explained with the high schools, as long as the students are 16-years of age or older, they can pre-register and once they turn 18-years they automatically become registered. CEO Nago informed that we want to target the high school level, get them signed up and ready to vote. The other thing is OE can register the voters but they may not actually vote. Why voting is important is another component that needs to be addressed, not necessarily by our office, but by the candidates. Turnout is an issue that only can be solved by participation of a lot of people, not simply by making it easier to register or making it easier to bring up the turnout, there are other factors that need to be looked at and addressed. CEO Nago added we are a part of the solution, we provide the registration forms, make them available, we have online registration now coming up for this election so, it's a solution but simply putting it on our shoulders, is not fair. It won't be solved that way; turnout will not go up basically by what we do. Commissioner King commented competitive races would help, and CEO Nago commented that's one of the ways.

Commissioner Kitaoka mentioned at the last election, her organization tried to register 16 year olds, so that's what they will target again, but inquired if OE would consider working with the elementary schools. CEO Nago advised that elementary schools has the program known as Kids Voting, which is not by OE. CEO Nago commented that we can work with elementary school students, but we are targeting 16 years and older since they can actually register. Commissioner Kitaoka asked if OE will work with her organization and the 16 year olds. CEO Nago responded affirmatively, and stated that the DOE is currently working with OE and anyone who is 16 years or older. Commissioner Kitaoka commented that the Superintendent is also a member on the Civic Education Committee.

Commissioner Limtiaco inquired regarding the online voter registration capability, can individuals use their phones? CEO Nago responded, yes, but they will need to have a Hawaii Driver's License or State ID, for the signature, one or the other.

Chair Marston asked if there were any comments or questions, as there were none, he thanked CEO Nago.

Chair Marston stated, turning to Item VII, is there any further discussion about the method of evaluation that we've gone through on the Chief Election Officer.

VI. Discussion of 2015 Legislative Bills as they affect the Office of Elections and the Elections Commission and action, if appropriate

Deputy AG Kunimoto requested to go back to Item No. VI, discussion of legislative bills. Deputy AG Kunimoto stated, in addition to the legislative bills that CEO Nago reported in agenda item no. V, House Bill No. 15 also passed and is currently being reviewed at the Attorney General's (AG) Office. She explained Ms. Janet Mason previously referred to this bill, indicating it was a good bill, dealing with the statewide distribution of absentee ballots, and the legislature tacked on a separate provision regarding the Elections Commission, which Ms. Mason referred to as a "Frankenbill". The bill was replaced with a different provision that deals with absentee ballot at the back end, and at the front end, providing that the Election Officer is an at-will employee, requires the performance evaluation within two months after the General Election is verified, and requires the Commission to hold a public hearing on the evaluation. The AG's Office is still looking at the bill to determine whether there are any problems with it, but it has been passed by the legislature, it's not retrospective, and does not affect any evaluation that is done today.

Commissioner Berg requested clarification whether the bill is the evaluation of the Chief Election Officer or the operations of the elections in general. Deputy AG Kunimoto stated it appeared to be both; since the performance evaluation of the Chief Election Officer is within two months after the General Election.

Commissioner Limtiaco informed that House Bill No. 15 is listed on the chart that was received previously, and noted it states transmitted to Governor, and asked, when that is stated, does that mean it goes to the AG's Office. Deputy AG Kunimoto confirmed that the AG's office reviews bills that are transmitted to the Governor.

Commissioner Moore inquired if comments or discussion of the bill was required, and Deputy AG Kunimoto responded that no discussion was necessary but the Commission should be aware of the bill. Chair Marston asked if there were any comments on HB No. 15, and commented he doesn't think much has changed, the Elections Commission has always had the ability to determine the fate, if you will, of the Chief Election Officer. Deputy AG Kunimoto noted, HB No. 15 requires that the evaluation is done after the General Election. Commissioner Moore commented she thinks that's an important piece and feels very strongly that right after the election the Commission should get in gear to do that,

because that is when everything is fresh in the minds of the CEO and the Commissioners.

Commissioner Berg inquired how it relates to the Biennial Report that was just turned in. Deputy AG Kunimoto stated she was not sure what the relationship was but the evaluation and the report is due at the same time.

Commissioner Moore commented she did inquire of some legislator and this is totally separate; the Commission's report to the legislative body is advising them on what, how they might move forward and things they might do, whereas the evaluation of the CEO is a totally separate function of our Commission, and we have to separate the two.

Chair Marston added that since the evaluation was required within two months of the General Election, it must be completed by the first part of January. This means that the Commission will have to schedule meetings through the holidays, which may or may not be convenient for everybody, so there is a time consideration there.

Commissioner King asked CEO Nago how long is certification process usually, and CEO Nago responded 20-days after the election. Deputy AG Kunimoto noted it would be approximately Thanksgiving.

VII. Discussion of method of evaluation for the Chief Election Officer and action, if appropriate

Chair Marston asked if there was any discussion on the method of evaluation that we have gone through for the Chief Election Officer. Commissioner Orikasa commented that he thought it was well laid out and thought it provided a good opportunity for the Commissioners to discuss. Chair Marston commented, we will discuss that obviously in Executive Session.

Commissioner Moore stated she had a comment, and stated she felt this is too important for her to speak extemporaneously, so she read the following statement:

> *"I'm concerned and disappointed by the potential breach of confidentiality in handling our individual responses, I feel it disrespects the private process of the Commission still working to reach a consensus and it disrespects the CEO undergoing this stressful process of performance evaluation yet again, perhaps it was too much to ask a human being who has worked as the CEO's right hand for at least five years to be the sole container of inside information. It appears that the required May 1st 2015 deadline for our submissions had less to do with providing turnaround time to*

share responses with each Commissioner and more to do with informing the CEO and staff throughout the state which way the wind was blowing. My concern is farther reaching, how can we attract substantive Commissioners and Chairs moving forward, this has already been a serious problem how do we establish the autonomy of the Commission to act without undue outside influence or interference. I fear we've been compromised."

Chair Marston asked, how Commissioner Moore felt the Commission has been compromised. Commissioner Moore responded, she knows for a fact that some of what we have shared was not kept as confidential as the Commission had wished it to be; that may not matter to most people, but she thinks that most of the Commissioners taking on this position are aware of the high profile nature of what the Commission is doing; she is concerned about the Commission's process, because her understanding, based on prior Commission meetings was that, the Commission would have a confidential exchange of information, then the Commissioners would meet in Executive Session; and out of the Commission as a body there would come a consensus of what was best moving forward.

Chair Marston commented that is what the Commission is going to do.

Commissioner Young asked Commissioner Moore, when she said compromise, what is she talking about? Chair Marston stated he does not understand. Commissioner Young then asked, how the Commission got this shared information compromised. Commissioner Moore responded that she does not want to, and is not here to try to point a finger. Commissioner Young restated, when Commissioner Moore said "compromise", how does she know it was compromised and to what degree was it compromised? Commissioner Moore responded that she has information or people have approached her about her comments that she sent in. Commissioner Young noted, comments that Commissioner Moore sent to Judy Gold, leaked out, or was shared with others? Commissioner Moore stated, correct, yes, somehow yes, and that dismays her. Commissioner Young stated he would like to know what it is, and if Commissioner Moore would want to share that. Commissioner Moore stated, to be honest, she intends to share that in Executive Session. But, for the record, she felt she needed to make her statement and she'll share, hopefully among Commissioners, because that's where it's properly placed, to be discussed.

Chair Marston noted it will be deferred to Executive Session.

VIII. Open Forum: Public comments on issues for the Commission's consideration for the next Commission meeting and action, if appropriate. Presentations limited to three minutes.

a. County of Kauai – Ms. Nina Magoun responded, no comments, but thanked the Commission for the opportunity.

b. County of Maui – Mr. Nishita responded, no comments from Maui.

Danny Mateo – Mr. Mateo, County Clerk from the County of Maui, thanked the Commission for this opportunity to comment. Although he had the opportunity to provide testimony on the island of Maui, he felt it was important enough to be here and share his comments with the Commissioners directly. Mr. Mateo commented the Clerks had the opportunity to provide responses to the evaluation forms for part of the discussions later today with the reappointment or reevaluation of the CEO. Unfortunately for the counties, a lot of the questions that were proposed or presented to the County Clerks did not refer to the relationship between County Clerks' county operations and the Chief Election Officer. However, they did address directly those questions that did pertain to them, and in addition to those questions, Maui County also provided additional attachments responding to the evaluation of the Chief Election Officer. Further, as the County Clerk of the County of Maui, he also attached his own personal letter of support for the Chief Election Officer.

Mr. Mateo stated he does not know how involved each one of the Commissioners are with the elections process, but numerous working functions of elections can really become overwhelming and unless you are directly involved, or you participate, or see it, you don't really have a clue of the intricacies involved. Mr. Mateo explained that he wants to share with the Commissioners what he knows of the process and of dealing with the CEO. Mr. Mateo stated he's a newly elected County Clerk for the County of Maui; he's been in office for about one-year and five-months, and for him, when he needed to get information about the elections process, the Chief Election Officer was there for him. When he needed clarification on the processes, because the elections process that he deals with is overwhelming, the Chief Election Officer was there. When he needed explanations about policies, the Chief Election Officer was there to help him. When he had to deal with challenges and disqualifications of candidates, the Chief Election Officer was there. When Maui County had to deal with a very hotly contested initiative process, the Chief Election Officer did provide support, encouragement, and also made resources available to them, in attempting to deal with their own difficult process. So, for him, it is reassuring to know that the State does have a CEO that treats the County Clerks as part of a team. Mr. Mateo stated, we are not Maui Island, we are not Kauai, we are not Big Island, we are one team, and in order to make this very difficult process work, he is very pleased and very proud to have been a part of this last election and working with the CEO at this point. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity of being able to be here this morning and sharing his own mana`o and his feelings.

Commissioner Young asked, in a nutshell, whether Mr. Mateo was happy with this Chief Election Officer. Mr. Mateo responded that he is because of many reasons and one is the accountability and the responsiveness that he and the counties, from the neighbor islands, got directly from the CEO.

Commissioner Moore asked for clarification as to how long Mr. Mateo was in his position before the Primary. Mr. Mateo noted the Primary was in August and he started the ending of December, so about eight months.

c. County of Hawaii – Ms. Saiki responded, no comments from the County of Hawaii.

d. City and County of Honolulu

Cindy Vaillancourt – Ms. Vaillancourt stated in the interest of full and fair disclosure, she is here on her personal time, she is a state employee, and works for the House of Representatives. She advised she is also part of the Election Observer Team which happens to be one of the most robust in the country. Additionally, Ms. Vaillancourt noted she has worked in election processes in other states besides Hawaii as a concerned citizen.

Ms. Vaillancourt stated, throughout the hearings and reading information that we see, it seems there is a lot of information that gets out there that is not really vetted.

Ms. Vaillancourt noted that Commissioner Moore had mentioned a breach of confidentiality, something of that, and it reminded her of another meeting several months ago where someone came in, said, "we heard that they were doing this, and they were doing that", and Ms. Vaillancourt had to get up and had to say, excuse me but I'm here to say, when you were accusing people, and the CEO and his team of not being in the Capitol at a certain time, and as one of the Observers, I was there and I was actually able to say, okay, this is truly what happened. That particular official did comment to Ms. Vaillancourt that she is glad she knew somebody who was there. However, Ms. Vaillancourt's initial reaction was though, perhaps she should have checked her facts before she went on public record with the letter stating what several of her constituents had told her.

Ms. Vaillancourt noted that she works for an elected official and she also knows that with the number of calls that is received in their office, there are basically three sides to every issue - yours, mine and the truth. So, we do have to do a whole lot of fact-checking on that.

Ms. Vaillancourt stated she is saying this because she feels that in the State of Hawaii, having been involved with the Election Observer Team, and based on

her experience with process development for private corporations, for the military, for non-profits, one of the things she can unequivocally say though, is the leadership that we have gotten from the current CEO in terms of what is expected of the folks who are Observers, and what is expected of the public, going to different locations during the early voting; and as a person who has been trained by the U.S. Air Force to know how to go in and spot things, she thinks that as American tax payers, you've got your money's worth on that. Ms. Vaillancourt added she can pretty quickly see if there is something that is not going as it should be. And she would like to say though, that, her experience here in the state, and she's been doing this since she moved here permanently, almost six years ago, her experience compared to other states, we have somebody who really cares. And when we hear of things, we have to take them with a grain of salt, and before any actions are taken, she would ask that not only as members of the Commission, but also as individuals, the Commission should make sure that it's something that really happened, that is verifiable. There are three sides to every story, yours, mine and the truth, and she thinks that as members of the public, and as members in the position of the public trust, that is something that we should strive for, in whatever the issue at hand may be.

Commissioner Young asked Ms. Vaillancourt, in a nutshell, you saw the election being held, what is your observation.

Ms. Vaillancourt responded, from the first time she started working, which was the Special Election in 2010, she feels that the procedures are in place, people are aware of the procedures, there's been a thorough job of making sure the people have resources, but she sees this not only from that team but also from members of the public. When she goes to Honolulu Hale, and there is early walk-in voting where she does her voting, she sees they are responsive people, and she sometimes will listen and see if they are giving the correct answer. So, yes, from the slice of observation she has been able to have in differing areas, again, as Election Observers we go out to the warehouse and we test. The media comes out, they show this on TV, and she feels that those processes are well-thought through.

If there are any gaps or issues, she feels she can pick up the phone, and go either to the CEO or somebody there and say, hey, she noticed this. A note is taken on it and you know what? She got a call back, stating this is what happened, we found this, we solved this, and thank you for bringing that up. She added, for her, in the areas of responsibility that she has had, yes, it has been. Even in the arena in her official job, they have had incidents where people came and called and said certain things, at least she knows who she can go to, but she also knows, that she is not going to repeat, unverified, unconfirmed information. And, based on those situations, we were able to make some calls and said, yes, that was handled the way it should have been.

Commissioner Young inquired if the SOPs, Standard Operating Procedures, are adequate, and in good order. Ms. Vaillancourt responded yes; she added her area is sliced, but yet again, she's trained to be able to look at an organization and have had to do inspections in 15-minutes, so she can tell you pretty much what the morale of the organization was, and where there were any liabilities. Ms. Vaillancourt added she comes with 40 years of experience in working with these kinds of things with individuals and organizations and she thinks that it gives her an eye that's trained a little differently to understand that it is not always what you see on the surface, or what appears on the surface.

With no further comments, Chair Marston asked for a motion to go into executive session to consider and discuss the evaluation and retention or reappointment of the Chief Election Officer, pursuant to Section 92-5(a)(2), HRS; to consider and discuss the salary adjustment for the Chief Election Officer, pursuant to Section 92-5(a)(2), HRS; and consult with the board's attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the board's powers and duties regarding the expiration of terms and the anticipated vacancy of the Elections Commission chair.

The motion was made by Commissioner Young and seconded by Commissioner Moore and unanimously approved by the Commissioners.

The Commission dissolved into Executive Session at 10:39 a.m.

IX. Executive Session

Pursuant to Section 92-5(a)(2), HRS, to consider and discuss the evaluation and retention or reappointment of the Chief Election Officer, where consideration of matters affecting privacy will be involved.

Pursuant to Section 92-5(a)(2), HRS, to consider and discuss salary adjustment of the Chief Election Officer, pursuant to Section 11-1.6(e), HRS, and action, if appropriate.

Pursuant to Section 92-5(a)(4), HRS, to consult with the board's attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the board's powers and duties regarding the expiration of terms and discuss the anticipated vacancy of the Elections Commission Chair, and action, if appropriate.

The Commission resolved into open meeting at 12:19 p.m.

X. Discussion of the reappointment of the Chief Election Officer and action, if appropriate.

Chair Marston announced that the Commission has voted today to retain Scott Nago as the Chief Election Officer, to continue through his current term and for a new term beginning on February 1, 2016.

XI. Discussion of salary adjustment of the Chief Election Officer and action, if appropriate.

Chair Marston announced, in addition to that, a salary committee had been appointed, composed of himself, Commissioner Patricia Berg and Commissioner Charles King to report back to the Commission, their recommendation at the next meeting.

XII. Discussion on search for Elections Commission Chair and action, if appropriate.

No discussion or action.

XIII. Adjournment

The next meeting will be scheduled on Thursday, July 9, 2015, at this location, and will be a video conference meeting.

With no further business before the Commission, Chair Marston asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Young, seconded by Commissioner Berg and approved unanimously by the Commissioners.

Elections Commission meeting was adjourned at 12:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy A. Gold
Elections Commission Secretary