

Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission Regular Meeting

June 2, 2021

A regular meeting of the Ethics and Elections Commission (SEEC) convened remotely. Commission Chair Richard Shordt called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. and Vice Chair Hardeep Singh Rekhi, and Commissioners Bruce Carter, Kristin Hawes, Zachary Pekelis Jones, Susan Taylor, and Judy Tobin were present. Executive Director Wayne Barnett was present and was joined by staff members Chrissy Courtney, Randal Fu, Polly Grow, René LeBeau, Marc Mayo and Annie Tran, along with Assistant City Attorneys Teresa Chen and Gary Smith.

Action Items

1) Minutes for May 10, 2021 special meeting

The Chair asked if there were any comments or edits for the May 10th minutes. There were none and there was a motion to approve the minutes from the Vice Chair which was seconded by Commissioner Pekelis Jones. The motion was approved unanimously.

2) Confirmation of new staff member

The Director informed the commission that Chrissy Courtney had accepted a position implementing the updated lobbying law, and she has gone from Administrative Assistant to Systems Management Analyst, and she was already confirmed when first hired, so no confirmation is needed for her position today, but Randal Fu will be taking on the Management Systems Analyst position. Mr. Fu has both a bachelor's and master's degree from the University of Washington and has been a standout performer in previous elections working with the Democracy Voucher Program and the Director encouraged the commission to confirm him to the position. Commissioner Tobin moved to approve, and the motion was seconded by

Commissioner Hawes. The motion was approved unanimously. The Chair congratulated Mr. Fu and Ms. Courtney and said the team that the Director has assembled has been great.

3) Rule regarding Voucher Replacement forms

The Chair noted that there were several folks from various campaigns in attendance to speak regarding the voucher replacement rules and asked that the comments be limited to a minute when possible. Alex Koren and Katherine Bobman from the M. Lorena González campaign spoke first. Ms. Bobman thanked the commission and said there were a few clarifying points; she was asking that the King County lifting of restrictions be the trigger for release instead of a statewide lifting, and the second point was to confirm that those replacement vouchers can be signed by a campaign staff member even though they are not being collected by a person because the resident was signing them through an online program. Mr. Koren stated that they understand the need for transparency in the process and they believe the rules as written were fine as to paid staffers or contractors, an employee of the campaign can follow these rules to the letter. The concern comes from the volunteer aspect, having worked with volunteers closely in the past, the concern was that there could be instances where volunteers go out on their own volition and then collect without their badge, and with volunteers he would hate to see someone who is participating in the democratic process have their supported candidate punished because they have forgotten their badges. Mr. Koren stated that there was an organization that tries to stifle grassroots organizing and tries to catch out the volunteers for any infractions and so he would ask for leniency when it comes to volunteers in the field.

Commissioner Carter said that he read with great concern about the program in The Stranger and it would seem to him that at first glance when there is a corruption to the program, then it would seem to be the responsibility of the candidate, and asked Mr. Koren for his views.

Mr. Koren asked if the campaign read about in The Stranger was the one where someone was out there saying that the replacement forms were for the homeless, and Commissioner Carter confirmed that was the story he meant. Mr. Koren said he believed that those were paid contractors and he does not disagree with any of the rules that apply to paid contractors and these rules should not be an issue, but in regard to volunteers, the campaign would continue to do their best to advise their volunteers to follow the rules, but the volunteers are on their own time and the campaign cannot in every single instance see every single thing the volunteers are doing, and his concern was for someone who was volunteering as opposed to a paid contractor.

Commissioner Carter asked who was responsible for the volunteer if they corrupt the program. Mr. Koren said that the campaign would train the volunteers and they cannot fire them. Commissioner Carter said that if they were not complying, then they could be kicked off the campaign. Ms. Bobman said that the concern was more that the volunteer lost their badge, or forgot it in the car, and her opinion was that if the volunteer does miss something, then they would like some leniency for those volunteers, because they don't want to have a gotcha pulled on someone who is trying to be a good volunteer but new to the process.

The Vice Chair said he did not see the proposed rule having any kind of rigidity to it in terms of a violation, noting that the Director may take certain actions, and all those factors would be considered when a complaint came before the commission if a violation occurred. Someone does have to be held responsible for the volunteers, but the commission understood the position of the campaign and it would be taken into consideration.

Commissioner Hawes said that the Vice Chair made her point, but if you can trust people to go out and collect vouchers on behalf of a campaign, then they can be trusted to follow the basic rules, and they do not want to suppress activity but they want to have rules that can apply

to everyone. The Chair asked if the Director or Assistant City Attorney Gary Smith could respond as to their views on the issues raised by the campaign.

The Director said that based on the volunteer question, there was sufficient flexibility in response. Commissioner Tobin asked if in the past the vouchers were taken up by volunteers and said she was uncertain why the volunteer issue was so big now. The Director said that in 2017 among the first feedback from the campaigns was the problem of residents not being able to find their vouchers when a candidate went to their doors and asked for their vouchers, and the campaign replacement form was meant to enable that face to face contact between the campaign and the resident. While it is important the rules be applicable across the board, what has been seen over the last two cycles, is that there has been a monetization of the process.

Commissioner Tobin expressed her concern about taking away the purpose of this form, which was to get the candidate in front of the people, and she was concerned that it was going awry. The Director said that campaigning was a team sport, and there was no way for the candidate to gather all vouchers themselves, and volunteers and representatives were contemplated when the program was designed.

Commissioner Pekelis Jones said that Commissioner Carter's concern would equally apply to a volunteer as to a paid voucher collector, but the rule as drafted could possibly apply to a volunteer without the campaign who could collect vouchers without the cooperation of the campaign, and the rule could be written to exclude volunteers who are not working with the campaign, and he asked Mr. Koren for his thoughts.

Mr. Koren asked to clarify that the rule would apply to volunteers who are working for the campaign and not to volunteers who are not working with the campaign. The Director said that the representatives must be authorized by the campaigns as the law was written.

The Vice Chair said he read the same thing and had the same concerns, but the campaign had to confirm that the representatives are there with the consent of the campaign. He worried about how that incentivized campaigns to be more hands off and not do any kind of training or education so that the volunteer could collect the vouchers without being directed by the campaign. The Vice Chair said he thought it was a good proposal, but he was concerned about the incentive and he was not speaking about any specific campaign, just in general.

Commissioner Taylor said she read The Stranger article, and she was concerned that folks did not know what they were signing and since it was not their money directly, they might not be as concerned to get to the truth, and it was different when the vouchers were mailed directly to a resident. Commissioner Taylor asked if there was some disclosure that said assigning your vouchers was the same as donating to a campaign. Commissioner Taylor noted that having the badge doesn't necessarily solve it all, but she did like the rule and wanted to add this additional concern.

Commissioner Pekelis Jones said that even if people know what vouchers are, they may not know that they are limited to four in a cycle, and he wondered if as a matter of course the campaigns and their representatives were disclosing that when they were gathering vouchers. Mr. Koren said that their campaign approach was to be as transparent as possible and to explain that this was money that goes to the campaign for Mayor and that was what they are teaching their people to say, but they are not necessarily saying every time that the resident gets only get four vouchers, but they would clarify that if it was asked. Mr. Koren said he would not have an issue with making that part of their process, but he was concerned about getting into too many details. The only thing that he would reiterate and ask for leniency with was the volunteers and one

person not getting it quite right was different than a systemic problem where people are told to say misleading things.

Commissioner Taylor said that she was thinking it would be nice to have a bullet point script so there is some succinct language to explain. The Chair said he thought it was a good discussion, but there were probably more people who would like to speak and there could be a discussion about what made the most sense and then moving forward with making decisions about whether or not to amend the rule. The Chair said Riall Johnson had indicated that he would like to speak to the commission on this matter, and he wasn't sure if Mr. Johnson was still on the call and would like to speak. There was no response from Mr. Johnson at that time.

The Chair asked the Director his thoughts on adding a provision that would encourage individuals to make that type of disclaimer. Attorney Smith said that it was probably best to have a requirement that there be information presented in conjunction with the replacement form rather than dictate what the individuals say in specific interactions, without having to recite a particular set of speaking points. Mr. Koren said that if there were a second part to the form that had all the information on the back of the replacement form, that might be a practical solution.

The Chair asked Teresa Chen, who took the lead on drafting the rule, if she would like to speak and she deferred to Commissioner Hawes. Commissioner Hawes asked if there was a rule for disclosure requiring the campaign to say that the vouchers can be used for more than one office. Attorney Chen said that the rules did not currently address that issue. Attorney Chen said there was a declaration that goes with petitions and there was room to add information on the front of the form instead of the back, due to the brevity of the interaction, and they could try to match the language from the petition process.

The Chair said that made sense and he asked whether that approach should be taken and whether the form has to be approved by the commission or whether the Director can update it. Attorney Chen said that the commission could update the rule and then the Director could update the form based on the commission's direction. Attorney Chen noted that in regard to Attorney Smith's recommendation that specific speech not be required, based on the current draft of the rule, that would mean striking 4b on the second rule. Commissioner Pekelis Jones had suggested a revision to 4b, to change verbally to orally, but he did not have a strong feeling about requiring an oral disclosure requirement, just that it should be explained correctly if there was to be one.

The Vice Chair said he liked the idea of having the disclosure form and he would also suggest that the person disclose who they are working for, and that could deal with some of the issues about the badges earlier and that could be included in a sample form provided to the candidates. Commissioner Taylor said she envisioned not a separate form but actually changing the top of the existing form and asked which was being contemplated. The Vice Chair concurred with Commissioner Taylor that the existing form could be altered. The Chair asked if there was a requirement that the candidate name be pre-printed on the form, and the Director said it was not required. The Vice Chair continued that if the replacement form is changed, then there could be a disclosure that indicated whether someone was a paid worker or not, and then could have whatever other disclosures are deemed appropriate by the commission.

Ms. LeBeau asked to ensure understanding that if the commission was going to strike 4b, which required that someone say, "I am collecting vouchers for such and such candidate", and that disclosure would instead be written on the form. The Vice Chair said that was correct, but that 4b would not be struck entirely, but just the word 'verbally' and the disclosure could be on the form. Ms. LeBeau said that after having discussions with residents who did not understand

what they were signing she was uncertain that it would be to the resident's advantage to put more on the form to be read during a quick interaction rather than being a verbal disclosure which would not ask the resident to take in something written.

Commissioner Pekelis Jones said he agreed with Ms. LeBeau that it was very common for signers to go on the say so of the promoter of the initiative and not read fully, so it may be sensible to retain subsection 4b. The Vice Chair asked if in lieu or in addition. The Chair said from an accessibility standpoint, he would think in addition instead of in lieu, and he did not think it was too much for the campaigns to update the form and to orally when possible provide that information. The Chair continued that we want as many individuals as contacted by these campaigns to understand what they are being asked to do.

Commissioner Taylor asked Ms. LeBeau the number one question she was getting from the residents and what message she would like encapsulated to the person being asked for replacement vouchers. Ms. LeBeau said that the residents she had spoken with were not aware what they were signing, but there was an idea that they agreed with, and yet they were not necessarily ready to assign their vouchers. The residents then end up asking for replacement vouchers and staff finds that they have already assigned their vouchers through a replacement form and the resident may have supported a belief or an issue but not necessarily the candidate, and they did not know they were assigning their vouchers.

Commissioner Taylor said it was interesting that the resident was finding out that they had "spent" their vouchers from the office and it seemed clear they don't understand they only have four and then they're gone. Commissioner Hawes said there was a brief suggestion that disclosure could replace a badge requirement but she thought it was important to ensure that people were making educated choices and fully appreciating what they are doing with their

vouchers that there be a badge should be displayed as well as a verbal disclosure. Commissioner Tobin said that she believed the campaigns should be taking responsibility for the message and she did not understand why the campaigns were not taking responsibility for who they were representing before they get a signature and she asked if that was too much to ask.

The Director said it was not too much to ask but what was being dealt with were competing incentives, there are incentives for the campaigns to gather as many forms as they could, and incentives from the contractors who are being paid per form gathered. There were good reasons for campaigns to be as up front as they can because they would like the resident's vote as well, and the struggle is how to bring incentives that produce the desired outcomes, which are that residents are assigning vouchers in a way that makes them feel valuable and valued and that does not harm the program. Commissioner Tobin said you can put verbiage all over everything but if the campaign cannot train their volunteers to say how they are representing a campaign, then the candidate should take responsibility and she understands that volunteers cannot always be watched but that there should be a statement of which candidate was being represented. Mr. Koren said he completely agreed with Commissioner Tobin and that was a reasonable request, and what he was seeking was that understanding, that things are not always in the control of the campaign, but that the training should be done by campaigns.

The Chair asked if there was a requirement that volunteers or employees be trained by a campaign if the candidate is participating in the Democracy Voucher Program. The Director answered that there was not, and the Chair asked if there should be. The Director said there was some tension between wanting everything to go well and also trying to not micromanage.

The Chair said this was an excellent conversation so far and asked if there were any other comments or questions from commissioners on the rules as proposed. Commissioner Pekelis

Jones said that he had his concerns addressed and the only way a person could get a replacement form was through a campaign, so there was no real reason for a volunteer who would not be authorized by the campaign and that addressed his definitional concerns and now the question was what the content of the disclosure should be and there was perhaps not yet consensus there. The Chair said that he agreed and once the edits from the commissioners are addressed, then there could be another review of the rule. Commissioner Carter said looking at the documents there are now 15 candidates for Mayor and there are a lot of different degrees of sophistication in those running the campaigns and he wanted to make things clear for all the campaigns.

Commissioner Pekelis Jones said that in addition to the actual rule, a written or signed disclosure, there should be an oral disclosure, and some kind of directive to the Director to change the form itself to add more information for residents to learn more about the program. The Chair said he believed that was correct and he believed the directive to the Director would be a new paragraph instead of under Section 4. The Chair said he also believed there should be discussion on the expiration of the rule. The Chair said there were campaigns who spoke to paragraph 5 regarding the online posting as well and he would like thoughts on those points. The Chair said that he believed the changes need to be made today, the Director said the emergency rule will expire next week if the commission were to do nothing today, and the online replacement forms would go away, and there was some urgency on rule two but it could be addressed today or at a new meeting.

The Chair said he thought this could be worked through today and if not, they could address postponing it at the end. The Chair spoke to Commissioner Pekelis Jones's suggestion of slightly modifying the third line to replace integrity of the 'election' process to the 'initiative and

referendum' process so that it matched closely the language in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and the commissioners agreed.

Moving to the online posting, there were some thoughts from campaigns about the time period this should be in effect. The González campaign commented about pegging this to King County instead of the state and the Chair asked counsel to weigh in and he said that the Governor said that in 28 days there would be a rescindment of the state rules. Attorney Smith said that he had worked on this portion and he said it was a good suggestion and there were no legal problems with pegging to the King County public health directive instead of statewide.

The Director asked whether King County had the authority to mandate social distancing. Attorney Smith said that King County had the inherent authority. The Governor had not yet issued a mandate, but he has deferred to local agency in the jurisdictions. The Chair said the only mandate in place was the Governor's and on June 30 that would be rescinded, and there was guidance from King County but no mandate. Commissioner Hawes said she just looked at the King County directive and it was about masks, not social distancing.

Commissioner Pekelis Jones said it was his understanding that the June 30 date was referring to the phased reopening and that would be lifted but would not necessarily pertain to the state of emergency due to the Covid 19 pandemic and the social distancing requirements.

The Director said that his goal was that this rule expires as soon as possible because this was a large change and he would be reluctant to have this go on longer than needed. The Chair said he thought that made sense, he did want to balance safety with picking a date certain, which was out of his wheelhouse. The Chair asked if there were any other restrictions than the Governor's that would relate to social distancing. Attorney Smith said he did not believe so, but he was trying to anticipate the state lifting directives but King County having a directive that is

more restrictive, and he would suggest that perhaps it be more generic to anticipate in any unforeseen circumstance in the future. Commissioner Carter said if it was the hope to get out of this at the soonest opportunity, then why not draft around that expectation. Commissioner Pekelis Jones said the alternative would be to kick the can and address the expiration at the next meeting. The Chair said that they would want to revisit it no matter what at the next meeting, but the emergency rule does expire next week so the online option would expire entirely next week if they did nothing today. Commissioner Taylor said her feeling was to make it something objective and verifiable rather than generic, and she liked something tied to a specific declaration expiring. From the Chair's perspective it would be easier and cleaner to use the phrasing as suggested by Attorney Smith, rather than waiting for multiple proclamations. Attorney Smith said this was all based on the Director's decision, and there could be a clause of "as determined by the Executive Director" which could address unforeseen situations.

The Chair asked Riall Johnson to speak since he did not have a chance to speak earlier, and Mr. Johnson asked about which rule, he had to step out earlier. The Chair said that it was the first rule and Mr. Johnson said that in the interest of avoiding fraud the forms online should be limited, he noted that there are usually only a few places where forms can be found and he would recommend removing the online pdf due to the risks. The Chair said he appreciated Mr. Johnson's comment and that it was addressed at the last meeting, due to exactly the risks Mr. Johnson noted, and these are not pdf files, but that the online piece was separate and could only be completed online and not printed from the campaign websites.

The Chair asked about the applicable proclamations or orders, what would be the right way to say that to take the more general approach; and Attorney Smith answered that the language around the expiration of applicable restrictions mandating social distancing as

determined by the Executive Director should work. The Chair asked if there were concerns about taking that general approach while allowing the Director to make a decision quickly to move away from this unique circumstance. Commissioner Taylor said that she was fine with it and so did Commissioners Tobin and Carter. Commissioner Pekelis Jones said that he would hope that the Director would consider leaving this in place to avoid unnecessary in person contact and avoiding undue risk. The Director confirmed that he would not make that decision by himself and he would be mindful of the public health concerns.

The next proposed change was to the language regarding the word “accepting”, since no one person is accepting the form when submitted online, and the change would be to say the person who submits it to the commission or who processed the form, and the Chair asked the Director or Program Manager to respond. The Director said that they would want the person who processed the form, meaning the person who would verify and submit the form to the SEEC, to be the signer. The Director suggested that the term ‘process’ would be marginally better than ‘accepted’ and there were no concerns from the commissioners so that change would be made. The Chair said that moving on to the rule on replacement collection, there have been questions on definition but that was resolved by noting that only campaign representatives are allowed to collect the replacement form. Commissioner Pekelis Jones asked if it was said that the form could not be printed, and the Director noted that it was in the rule and no forms of that kind have been received while the emergency rule has been in effect.

The Chair moved on to Section 4 and the change to replace ‘verbally’ with ‘orally’, and provide spoken word disclosure, the Chair asked if any concerns with that change, and there were none. The last piece would be a directive to the Director to revise the form appropriately and the Chair asked where to include such a sentence and what it should say and Attorney Smith

and Attorney Chen said that it should be a separate section and Attorney Chen said it could be in Section 7 of that rule. The Chair said that there should be an update to the voucher replacement form to identify that the vouchers are equivalent to a campaign donation. Commissioner Hawes said that there should also be disclosure that there were four vouchers per person for the entire election cycle and the races to which the vouchers could be applied, and the total amount of the money represented by the vouchers, to ensure educated choices by the residents.

The Chair asked Attorney Smith for the language that would allow the Director the ability to make updates to the form and the commission would direct the Director to include these disclosures. Attorney Smith answered that making certain the commission had included a clear list of the disclosures they wanted on the form should be sufficient to give the Director guidance. Commissioner Taylor said that as she looked at the replacement form it was not clear what a democracy voucher was, and the part that was important to her was that it was the same as donating to a campaign and that it was taxpayer dollars. The essence was that it actually represents funds, which the website does a great job of explaining, Commissioner Taylor noted.

Commissioner Pekelis Jones offered some language for Section 7; “The Executive Director shall revise the replacement democracy voucher form to a) describe the nature of the Democracy Voucher Program, b) identify all elections in which democracy vouchers may be used in 2021, and c) specify that each resident may submit no more than four total democracy vouchers for all elections in 2021. Commissioner Taylor asked if the provision for listing all the campaigns would include every campaign name or whether it would be at the level of the office and she would like to give the Director as much leeway as possible. The Director said that space on the form was a concern, and the other issue was regarding the campaigns that can use the form changes over time and so he would recommend against putting the individual campaign

names. Commissioner Hawes clarified that she would rather have the different races listed instead of the individual campaigns.

Commissioner Pekelis Jones asked if this disclosure would be on the back, and the Director answered that the commission seemed to indicate it should be on the front of the form so that it would be readily available to the resident. Ms. LeBeau stated that in 2017 when the form was first developed there were similar requirements added in, but looking at the old form, it was a lot to read. Ms. LeBeau continued that she liked the idea of having it written but verbalizing the form would be good, and she shared the 2017 form with the commissioners showing the original version as opposed to the current version of the form. She said that a two sided form could be challenging, and she was not sure who had access to double sided printers, but they could provide printed forms by the program. The 2017 form was more complex, but the Director said he thought there would be a way to blend the 2017 and 2021 versions and there should be room to compress the content on the current form and Ms. LeBeau agreed.

Attorney Chen said that there should be room to provide information at the top of the form as proposed by the Vice Chair and Commissioners Pekelis Jones and Hawes and she thinks it could be five lines or six lines but the more there was to read the less likely someone was to read it, so there should be a happy medium, or a way to have the information stand out visually as long as the commission was clear on what they want on the form. Commissioner Tobin said she agreed and the simplest would always be the most effective.

The Chair said that made sense and coming back to making sure there was enough guidance to the Director in the rule provision in Section 7 and whether the Director with legal guidance would have time to draft new language for review by the commission. The Chair asked Commissioner Pekelis Jones to repeat his proposed language for Section 7, which he did.

Attorney Chen asked if the Vice Chair had suggested to write the representative and the campaign on the form. Commissioner Tobin asked if this would represent the individual campaign workers name on the form. The Director said that yes, that is completed at the bottom of the form. Commissioner Tobin asked if the signatures of the person assigning the vouchers were still being validated and the Director answered yes, to address quality control, such as receiving forms that are from residents that are not residents of Seattle.

Commissioner Hawes noted that the fifth part of the rule indicated that when the form was submitted the representative should identify themselves, as well as indicating the date and time when the form was collected, as well as their signature and asked if that addressed the concern. Attorney Chen pointed out that the part of the rule referenced by Commissioner Hawes was completed after the interaction for staff processing purposes, but that the Vice Chair seemed to indicate earlier that the representative of the campaign be noted for purposes of interacting with the resident. The Vice Chair said that there should still be a verbal disclosure, but if that was missed, then there should still be another way for the resident to know which campaign.

Commissioner Taylor asked whether that meant that the campaign pre-filled the name of the candidate in the top box. The Director said that the campaigns generally do pre-fill that candidate or campaign name, but it is not a requirement. The Chair noted that for the online form, it was mandated that only one of the signature lines be required instead of all of them.

Mr. Johnson said that they do pre-print the forms with the campaign name because it was more efficient and easier and it speeds processing, and there was already a field for the date the form was signed by the resident. Mr. Johnson said that they also do pre-fill the campaign representative name at the bottom of the form, so the individual resident could see the name of the person collecting and that way the gatherers do not have to repeatedly sign their names.

The Chair said that he wanted to be respectful of time and asked whether there was a sense of how the language could be prepared today or whether there would be additional time needed. Attorney Chen said that the commission had provided enough direction, and she could work with the Director and Program Manager to redesign the form.

Commissioner Carter moved that the rule be adopted consistent with the substance of the agreements reached today, with no need for a further review. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hawes and passed unanimously.

Discussion Items

4) Democracy Voucher Program report

The Chair asked if there was anything else that Ms. LeBeau wanted to share, and Ms. LeBeau said that the update sent prior to the meeting was now outdated as more candidates have joined the program. Ms. LeBeau also noted that Annie Tran, Senior Communications Specialist, did some research looking at the ages of voucher users and looking at a snapshot there was an interesting change in that trend moving more towards younger engagement. Ms. LeBeau noted that it was an exciting election year and she wanted to thank the community based organizations for their help with the outreach. Ms. LeBeau asked if there were any questions. Commissioner Pekelis Jones thanked Ms. LeBeau and was excited about the outreach to youth and asked whether vouchers were available in translated languages and whether there had been outreach to legal permanent residents (LPRs) and was data collected this year to improve outreach to LPRs.

Ms. LeBeau answered that vouchers were available in 18 total languages currently but those were request driven because resident language preference is not known in advance of sending out the vouchers. The LPR situation was also being addressed and they were working to add more to that process. The Chair thanked Ms. LeBeau and moved to the Director's report.

5) Executive Director's report

a. Financial Interest Statements

The financial interest statements were due on April 15th and there were only ten or so employees outstanding as of that deadline and the following week they reached full compliance.

b. Budget update

The Director informed the commission that the budget had been submitted, and there were requests for more funds for the lobbying registration program, as well as the voucher program to improve the process to applying to the program for non-voters, noting that LPRs were a significant part of that group, along with how to streamline the applications and making a previously temporary position permanent.

c. July meeting.

The Director noted that the next scheduled commission meeting was on July 7th and asked that commissioners let him know of any anticipated problems with attendance, given the upcoming holiday. The Director thanked everyone for the great discussion.

Commissioner Carter said that since his term had expired and he was subject to replacement at any moment, he would like to suggest to staff to monitor situations based on The Stranger article because if the program was being harmed additional legislation may be necessary, because he was very alarmed by those allegations.

The Chair thanked everyone for the fruitful meeting and the staff for their work.

The Regular Commission meeting of June 2, 2021 adjourned at 6:05 p.m.