

MEETING OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF ELECTIONS
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK
HELD ON TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 2023 AT 1:30 P.M.
42 BROADWAY, 6th FLOOR, COMMISSIONERS' HEARING ROOM
NEW YORK, NY 10004

PRESENT: President Simon Shamoun
Secretary Rodney L. Pepe-Souvenir

Commissioners Jose Miguel Araujo, Michael J. Coppotelli, Carol R. Edmead, Jodi Morales, Frederic M. Umane

Michael J. Ryan, Executive Director
Vincent M. Ignizio, Deputy Executive Director
Georgea Kontzamanis, Operations Manager
Hemalee J. Patel, General Counsel
Raphael Savino, Deputy General Counsel
Steven B. Denkberg, Counsel to the Commissioners
Kenneth Moltner, Counsel to the Commissioners
Sherwin Suss, Agency Chief Contracting Officer

Mr. Ryan opened the meeting, and announced that today's meeting is being held in the 7th floor Executive Conference Room. The Commissioners' Hearing Room on the 6th floor is being used for the completion of the petition process. There is a monitor available in the EVS Conference Room on the 6th floor, allowing for public viewing and participation.

Mr. Ryan noted that Secretary Pepe-Souvenir will attend today's meeting from the Brooklyn Borough Office, but has been delayed due to transportation issues.

Mr. Ryan added item #3 to the meeting agenda, an Executive Session to discuss Personnel Matters, and asked that the Commissioners Committee move to Executive Session to resolve the personnel matters until Secretary Pepe-Souvenir arrives in the Brooklyn Office.

President Shamoun moved to convene an Executive Session to discuss personnel matters. Commissioner Araujo seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously.

Following Executive Session, the open meeting resumed.

Mr. Ryan noted that Commissioner Coppotelli has left the meeting, and Secretary Pepe-Souvenir has joined the meeting in the Executive Conference Room, which still leaves a quorum of 6.

Mr. Ryan continued with agenda item #2, the Absentee Ballot Vendor RFP.

Mr. Ryan informed the Commissioners Committee that previously the Board of Elections received such a little number of absentee ballots that the work could be divided amongst the five boroughs based on the voters that requested them in the respective boroughs, and the boroughs handled that process on a case by case

basis as they came in, and the Board would order a sufficient number of absentee ballots so they could be manually processed.

In 2020 due to the COVID-19 emergency there were several Executive Orders effecting elections. For the absentee voting process, there was an Executive Order that permitted voters to request an absentee ballot due to suffering from COVID-19 or fear of COVID-19, and was an acceptable excuse to allow for the absentee ballot to be mailed to the individual.

After further deliberation in Albany, that led to an Executive Order requiring the Boards of Elections throughout the State to mail an absentee ballot application to all registered voters. The volume of absentee ballots that were requested and processed increased expediently. For the Primary Election in 2019 the Board processed a total of 25,662 requests, and for the General Election we processed a total of 52,110. The 2019 Election would have been the most lightly attended election. The top of the ticket was the Staten Island and Queens District Attorney's Office, which is similar to this year. For the Primary Election in 2020, the Board processed a total of 767,634 requests, and over 1 Million for the General Election. This was well beyond what the Board was able to process internally.

In order to meet the requirements of those Executive Orders, the Board sought the assistance of two vendors that we had already been under contract with for Election Day ballots, and those vendors were Fort Orange Press and Phoenix Graphics. Under the emergency circumstances, and with the vendors' cooperation and assistance at arriving at a fair distribution of the work that they could each manage. The Board divided the work amongst the five boroughs, and both vendors provided absentee ballots for that particular election season.

The first election that we used the external absentee ballot processing was the Primary Election in 2020. This also included the Presidential Primary, which was moved from April to join the June Primary.

During that first mailing, Phoenix Graphics mailed out approximately 100,000 ballots to voters in Brooklyn. In that mailing it was determined that there were a number of voters that received the wrong oath envelope in their application packet once it was sent out. At the time this caused quite a public uproar, and Phoenix Graphics had recently engaged in an upgrade to their software which caused their backup data to be wiped out. As a result, they were not able to recreate that election from a tech perspective and could not zero in on the ballots that received the wrong oath envelope. Their estimate was about 500 ballots affected, but there was no way to tell. The remedy at the time, was for Phoenix Graphics to

re-mail approximately 100,000 ballots in Brooklyn. During that same election Fort Orange Press had a similar problem. They did not have software issues, and they were able to recreate and zero in on the voters that received the wrong oath envelope, and were able to re-mail approximately 349 ballots to voters.

Both vendors had a problem during that first mailing. One vendor had the ability to recreate the issue and was able to limit the exposure on the problem, the other vendor wasn't and had significant exposure on the problem. In the meantime, there was quite a bit of public excitement and uproar over the issue. There were a couple of main complaints from the public, one being that the Board of Elections issued a no-bid contract, and that it was somehow improper.

The Department of Investigation (DOI) issued a report on the matter on May 13, 2021. That report is available on the Department of Investigation's website in its entirety for anyone who wishes to review it. The report clearly states that the Board of Elections followed the proper emergency process for procurement of the services. There were no issues with the procurement, and the Board has been operating under those emergency procurement measures from then until now. Now that the COVID-19 emergency has been formally concluded at all levels, from an administrative perspective, the Board is moving forward to finalizing this process with a procurement process pursuant to the PPB Rules Section 3-03. Also within

that report, “DOI found no intent or motivation to intentionally disrupt Phoenix Graphic’s print run of the absentee ballots, nor did DOI find that the BOE improperly awarded the contract to Phoenix Graphics. DOI also found no evidence that a deletion during a software installation was purposeful”. There was no evidence of maleficence on either the Board’s part or the part of Phoenix Graphics.

Mr. Ryan stated that it still leaves ultimately the Commissioners to consider the mistake that was made by Phoenix Graphics, and that is something that Sherwin Suss, the Board’s ACCO, will discuss and how that was remedied.

The Board issued the RFP with a view towards having a single vendor for the absentee ballots, upon conference with technical staff there is an economy of scale to have all of the data be processed through one entity. There are several different databases internally, that all have to come together in order for an absentee ballot to be properly issued to the right individual. To streamline that process through one pipeline of communication makes sense, to avoid replicating the issue that we had during the 2020 election season by having two different vendors, and a single vendor has been selected for those reasons.

Secretary Pepe-Souvenir inquired about Phoenix Graphics quickly correcting the error at that time, and if the error was corrected at the vendor's expense.

Mr. Ryan confirmed that the error was corrected at the vendor's expense. The error affected approximately 1000 voters, but out of the 100,000 ballots that were sent to voters in Brooklyn, Phoenix Graphics could not zero in on which ballots were affected by the error and all 100,000 ballots were resent.

Due to the criticism of the Board and the vendor at the time, it was after the General Election in 2020 that Phoenix Graphics ceased being one of our absentee ballot vendors.

Fort Orange Press and Phoenix Graphics were both working under the emergency rules that were implemented at that time.

Once it was determined that there would be no additional Executive Orders requiring the Board to mail absentee ballot applications to all voters, the number of absentee ballot requests started to drop, as they have dropped in subsequent years but it is still much higher than it was prior to 2020.

President Shamoun asked if Fort Orange Press was used for the General Election in 2020, after the issue with Phoenix Graphics.

Mr. Ryan informed the Commissioners that Phoenix Graphics and Fort Orange Press were still utilized for the General Election in 2020, neither vendor had the ability to have sufficient throughput to handle a Presidential Election, and the Board was still dealing with the vast unknown.

At that time the contract with Phoenix Graphics was not terminated. Phoenix Graphics was the sub-contractor under a contract with ES&S as the contractor, and ES&S chose to withdraw from/or not submit a response the RFP for Election Day, which left the Board with Fort Orange Press, Bradford Bigelow and a third vendor, Triangle who's contract was ultimately terminated.

This led to Phoenix Graphics not being the Board's vendor directly for absentee ballots, and then indirectly for Election Day ballots.

Commissioner Araujo inquired about the Board's relationship with Fort Orange Press since they took over from Phoenix Graphics, and does distance of where they are physically situated have any effect on the Board's mailings.

Mr. Ryan informed the Commissioner that in the conclusion of the evaluation process it has been determined that Fort Orange Press is a responsible vendor and they've worked well for us. In regards to the past incident, the vendor has provided the Board with ten bullet points on how they've corrected the error and the fail safes for Phoenix Graphics and Fort Orange Press are identical.

Mr. Ryan also noted that Phoenix Graphics was also a responsible vendor for many years, in past years they provided the strips for the lever machines.

Mr. Ryan stated that he is happy answer any questions that the Commissioners may have regarding the preliminary matters, and instructed Mr. Suss to continue with the RFP process.

Mr. Ryan also indicated that there was a third vendor that responded to the RFP, a Southwest company from out of state, but their ballots failed and were not able to be scanned properly.

Mr. Suss addressed the Commissioners Committee, and informed them that the Request for Proposal (RFP), is under the 3.03 of the Procurement Policy Board Rules and generally requires that the agency put out specifically what we are looking for, and find companies that can provide the best value for the City. The

required process also entails an evaluation committee which reviews and grades the evaluations and gives a technical score to the companies. The technical score is given based on the evaluation committee's review of the written proposals submitted by the vendor, and the evaluation is completed based on criteria without any knowledge of the price.

In this particular case, the Board advertised in the City Record and received three responses to the RFP, and along with the written proposals there was end to end testing. In the first part of the testing, each company was given 500 ballots from our Electronic Voting Systems (EVS) Department and were told to reproduce these ballots and send them to us. Mr. Suss stated that our EVS Department did test the ballots received from the vendors, and the results of the testing was provided to the Commissioners. And as Mr. Ryan previously indicated, Mr. Suss stated that one company did not pass the EVS testing, and was invalidated from the evaluation process going forward.

Mr. Ryan reported that (EVS) is the Electronic Voting Systems Department within the Board, and they tested the viability of the ballots to determine if they could be properly scanned. As a result of the end to end testing, Mr. Ryan presented to the Commissioners several trays of actual ballot packages that were

prepared by the vendor, as if there was an actual election, and as if they were being returned to the Board by request of a vote.

Mr. Suss stated that the first part of testing involved the EVS Department, to test the parameters of the ballot and how it would fit and if it was properly skewed.

The second part of our end to end testing included the MIS Department, which is the Board's IT Department. The MIS Department created an election and sent the data to each vendor, the same way that live data would be sent during an election. The vendors had to consume this data, produce the envelopes and ballots, and then send it back to the Board. Each vendor was required to produce and send 750 ballots. That number included 125 ballots for the Democratic and Republican parties, for each of the 5 borough offices. And as indicated by Mr. Ryan, Mr. Suss presented 12 boxes of ballots that were received from the vendors.

Part of the testing was not only for the vendor to consume our data, but for them to send us back data so that we can get the IMB, the postage, which was loaded into our absentee ballot system so the voter can track the ballot, and processed internally so that it could tracked on the Board's end as well.

Mr. Ryan provided further clarification on the IMB number, and stated that this is the Individual Mail Barcode that allows the Board to complete the ballot tracker. The IMB is an essential element of this process, so that the Board is able to track the absentee ballot. When the application is processed in our system, whether the absentee application is received by paper or thorough the absentee portal, this starts the process and then the IMB allows us to close the loop and make a determination on if it has been received.

Secretary Pepe-Souvenir also noted that the voter can also contact the Board regarding the status of their ballot. Mr. Ryan confirmed, the voter can contact the Board or check the Board's website regarding their status. Once the ballot is mailed, and its status when tracked states that it is out for delivery, it will tell you where it has been and the various steps.

Mr. Suss continued his report on the evaluation process and stated that there were a total of 6 committee members that were chosen under the PPB rules, and they evaluated all of the written materials. In addition, the Board conducted virtual visits with two of the vendors, and an in person visit with Phoenix Graphics, at their facility in Rochester, New York, to view their equipment. The 6 committee members conducted their evaluations based on the following criteria:

- Was experienced in the printing of ballots,
- Equipment and staffing of each company,
- Procedures such as their quality controls,
- Data back up plans,
- Security plan for handling ballots,
- Security procedures for the disposal of overrun or incorrectly printed ballots.

After reviewing the criteria, the evaluation team provided a technical score for each vendor and the two companies, Phoenix Graphics and Fort Orange Press were tied with a final score of 55.5.

Mr. Suss reported that the next part of the evaluation process under the PPB rules, is to allow for a best and final offer. Both vendors were contacted, Phoenix Graphics did not change their price, but Fort Orange Press did reduce their price.

The vendors were requested to provide their best and final offer based on 1 page, and 2 page packaged ballots.

A packaged ballot contains an outgoing envelope that transmits the information to the voter. The actual printed ballot, an information notice which

includes any pertinent information to the voter, and a card with an “I Voted” sticker. In addition, there is a return envelope which the voter uses to return the ballot, and an oath envelope for the voter to place the completed ballot in before sealing and signing. The oath envelope once sealed and signed, is then placed in the return envelope and mailed back to the Board. The 1 page ballot package includes 1 page of a ballot, printed on both sides.

Phoenix Graphics’ pricing for the 1 page ballot package was \$1.50 per package, and \$1.85 for a 2 page package.

The initial Fort Orange Press pricing for a 1 page ballot package was \$4.25, and for a 2 page ballot package was \$4.75. When given the opportunity to provide their best and final offer, Fort Orange Press reduced their price for a 1 page ballot package to \$1.95, and \$2.25 for a 2 page ballot package.

The Board had an estimated quantity of ballots that were included in the RFP, based upon general printing with overage to include Special Elections and any unknown events. The amount of pricing is multiplied by the estimated quantity of ballots to create a contract ceiling. This is a not to exceed amount that the Commissioners vote upon, not that we have to spend that amount of money, but would be available to spend on this contract if needed.

This is a 4 year contract, with pricing based upon the best and final offer provided by Fort Orange Press, and the initial pricing provided by Phoenix Graphics. The total price for Phoenix Graphics would be \$4,891,575, and a total price of \$5,000,715 for Fort Orange Press, with a difference of approximately \$900,000 for full ballots including overages.

Mr. Ryan explained the differences between an absentee ballot contract versus an Election Day ballot contract. On an absentee ballot contract, the Board only pays for the absentee ballots that are requested, as opposed to Election Day when the ballots are printed based on the number of registered voters. There is an efficiency built within this contract where padding did not have to be added as you would for an Election Day ballot contract. The Board never gets 100% of the registered voters that come out to vote, but we prepare as if they could potentially come out to vote with this contract. If an absentee ballot request is received, it is processed and mailed out to the voter.

President Shamoun asked Mr. Suss for additional information regarding the 4 year term of this contract, and wanted to know if the term was a prerequisite based on a rule, and how the number was determined. Mr. Suss informed the Commissioner that generally when creating contracts the terms are based on an election cycle. Mr. Ryan noted that we try not to get involved in a new contract,

particularly with a new vendor during a Presidential Election year. In the event that there are any issues with the contract or vendor, they can be worked out when there is not as much pressure of volume.

Commissioner Araujo asked Mr. Suss for the name of the company that provides our Election Day ballots right now. Mr. Suss informed the Commissioner that the current vendors are Bradford & Bigelow and Fort Orange Press.

Mr. Ryan also informed Commissioner Araujo that Phoenix Graphics used to be the ballot vendor for Queens County, and stated that the theory at the time was that they were the most experienced vendor, and they were given the most difficult borough for printed Election Day ballots, but this is a different process.

Secretary Pepe-Souvenir stated that she noticed in the evaluation package the grading that the evaluators used, both Phoenix Graphics and Fort Orange Press were graded the same. The Commissioner wanted to know if either vendor etched out the other based on the evaluator's review. Mr. Suss informed the Commissioner that the vendors were not equal on all of the criteria, there were some instances where the score was higher for Fort Orange Press, but once all of the categories were scored they ended up being equal.

In regards to the categories, Commissioner Araujo stated that under quality control, one vendor scored a 3.5 and the other scored a 4.5, and wanted to know what the basis was for those scores. Mr. Suss stated that he was not a part of the evaluation committee, but the six members of the committee reviewed the results individually and then met together to discuss the criteria. Mr. Ryan reviewed #9 under the category regarding quality control, the evaluation committee stated that “Fort Orange Press stood out in a mailing test, turning around data quickly and reporting exactly as we’d expect twice daily”. Mr. Ryan stated that there were three categories where the vendors scored differently, were category #5, #9 and #13, but the overall evaluation ended in a tie.

Commissioner Araujo stated that the question really is, how much weight can we put on quality controls and geographical location compared to other things, and how that outweighs other categories. The Commissioner stated that his issue regarding a quick turnaround and the vendor’s access to the post office and the City of New York was calculated, and based on that Phoenix Graphics did score lower than Fort Orange Press. Phoenix Graphics is located in Rochester, New York and Fort Orange Press is located in Albany, New York. Mr. Ryan noted that Phoenix Graphics has stated that they are right down the block from a mailing facility in Rochester, New York.

Commissioner Umame asked if anyone has visited the two vendors at their locations. Mr. Ignizio informed the Commissioners that he visited both locations.

Mr. Ignizio stated that he visited Phoenix Graphics in Rochester, New York the facilities with Board staff, which included Tom Sattie, Sherwin Suss and Carlos Rodriguez. Mr. Ignizio stated that he also visited the facility at Fort Orange Press, in Albany, New York, and the staff attended virtually. During that visit Mr. Ignizio stated that both companies use the exact same equipment, and both had two banks in the event that one went down, the other could keep printing. Both companies also had camera systems on both top and bottom.

In the information provided by the evaluation committee, Mr. Ryan stated that with respect to Phoenix Graphics on that particular issue, the information stated that the cameras capture the front and back of the envelope using barcodes and offers images of each package in real time. In regards to Fort Orange Press, features include cameras that capture the front and back of each envelope using barcodes that capture images of each package in real time. Mr. Ignizio stated that he could not discern any difference between the equipment at both vendor locations.

Mr. Ryan stated that aside from backing up the data, for both companies, the upper and lower cameras that allow for the simultaneous capturing of the barcodes, both seemed to be selling that as a thing that makes sure that the package is sent to the right person, and the contents of that second barcode, whose package is being mailed. Mr. Ryan stated that since 2020, we did not have a repeat of that problem.

Mr. Suss stated that the windows on the back of the envelopes did not exist in 2020, but now the ID is on the return envelope and the visibility to see the contents.

Commissioner Araujo asked if there is a comfort level based on the discussions had with both vendors, and them being receptive to any concerns, and available when contacted.

Mr. Ignizio confirmed that the vendors are accessible, and always available. Mr. Ryan stated that with any vendor that we deal with we are always their biggest customer. In the evaluation committee's summation, both vendors were considered to be quality vendors and good to work with.

President Shamoun inquired about the difference between Phoenix Graphic's prices in 2020, and their current price.

Mr. Suss informed the Commissioner that their price in 2020 was the same price that Fort Orange is charging. Mr. Ryan stated that the Board is spending less for the absentee ballot mailings if compared from then until now. There were only three vendors that were willing to work with the Board, and two of the vendors were already working with us.

Commissioner Araujo asked if either one of these vendors are used to print other mailings for the Board. Mr. Ryan confirmed that the print vendors are only used for election mailings.

President Shamoun raised concerns regarding the Board's options if things do not go well, if one of these vendors is selected today. Mr. Suss informed the Commissioner that depending on the problem, there are many remedies under the PPB rules.

- Because we had an RFP, the Board can easily switch to the other vendor that was not chosen.
- Buy Against is another example – The Board can go out and buy the same product from the other vendor, and charge back against the defaulting vendor the difference in price if we had to pay more.

- There are remedies for non-performance as well.

Mr. Ryan informed the Commissioners that both vendors, to his knowledge, only print election and election related printing.

Mr. Ignizio informed the Commissioners that it has been determined that Phoenix Graphics does have other printing jobs, and Mr. Suss confirmed that during elections both vendors work exclusively on election related printing.

Secretary Pepe-Souvenir made an inquiry regarding the timeframe for making a decision between the two vendors. Mr. Ignizio informed the Commissioner that the ballots are scheduled to be mailed within the next three weeks, and noted that these are the ballots that will be used this year, and urgency is a factor.

Commissioner Umane addressed the group, and stated that it seems that we have potential reliability issues with the one vendor, but the problem was cured at the time with great expense that they had to endure. The other vendor has worked with the Board regularly, but there is a significant difference in terms of price, which may not be as exaggerated depending on the number of ballots that are actually sent out, which would affect the difference in the pricing. Based on the

pricing that was provided to the Commissioners, there is a \$900,000 difference, which Commissioner Umane noted is a lot of money, and the Board should be cognizant of that given the circumstances within the city. Commissioner Umane further noted that the Board would be criticized in the event that Phoenix Graphics is chosen due to the fact that the vendor is cheaper, and not going with the vendor that theoretically did the job right but cost an additional \$900,000. Commissioner Umane also noted that the Board would also be criticized for choosing the vendor that is more expensive, when both vendors tested out the same. Commissioner Umane stated that it is not an easy decision that the Board faces, but that is the balancing that has to be done.

President Shamoun stated that not too long ago the prices were considerably higher, and for whatever reason both bidder's prices are considerably lower. The vendor that we are currently working with is doing a good job and is a little higher, the vendor that had the issue is a little lower. President Shamoun stated that it seems that after coming down on the pricing, although it is a good deal, we also want the quality and the track record is important. President Shamoun stated that he feels comfortable with Fort Orange Press because we are working with them, things have been going well, there is a value that, and the prices are close enough that it can be given weight consideration.

Secretary Pepe-Souvenir stated that she agrees with President Shamoun as far as this is a company that we have been working with, why flip it now especially with the three week timeframe why would we start with someone new. Secretary Pepe-Souvenir noted that given our experience with Phoenix Graphics, although she is sure that the vendor would be on the up-and-up and in step to ensure that everything happens right, but going with Phoenix Graphics would be a problem for the Board and we should stick with Fort Orange Press.

Mr. Ryan reminded the Commissioners Committee that for today's purposes we only have 6 Commissioners present, so today's vote would have to be unanimous.

Mr. Ryan asked Mr. Suss, since we are under such tight parameters with the Commissioners, if we are unable to resolve this matter today or within the next couple of weeks, are we still permitted to proceed under the emergency provisions while this RFP process has not been concluded yet?

Mr. Suss informed Mr. Ryan and the Commissioners Committee that he could not use the emergency provisions, but there is a provision under the PPB rules that allows the ACCO to extend the contract up to a year if there is a need or a compelling reason.

Commissioner Araujo stated that he agrees with the concerns addressed by President Shamoun, Secretary Pepe-Souvenir and Commissioner Umane with respect to both companies. Commissioner Araujo stated that he finds more weight in the staff's evaluation based on the hand score that was given to each vendor. It appears that in certain vital areas Fort Orange Press scored 4's and 5's, noting that there were no 3's compared to Phoenix Graphics. Especially with the quick turnaround, and in regards to vendor securities and quality control, Phoenix Graphics scored lower than Fort Orange Press based on our staff. Commissioner Araujo stated that he is aware that Fort Orange Press may be a little more costly, but it is an up to number, which does not necessarily mean that there would be additional money spent. The Commissioner stated that based on the evaluations and recommendations of the staff, history with the vendor, gauged by the questions that he has asked, he feels that Fort Orange Press is the best route. Commissioner Araujo further noted that mathematically both may come out to be the same, but is looking at the physical numbers.

Commissioner Morales stated that she agrees with President Shamoun and Commissioner Araujo, and is leaning towards Fort Orange Press as well. The Commissioner stated that this decision is based on all of the reasons stated, but also because she would like for things to be done correctly, and spending more ensures

that; given the technology that the vendor has, and all of the other factors that were enumerated.

President Shamoun made a motion to accept the bid and proposal of Fort Orange Press to be our absentee ballot vendor for a 4 year term. Recognizing that both of our bids are quality companies, and is sure that they will continue to do work in their respective companies for years to come, and maybe for us also in the future, but at this time he makes the motion to accept the bid and proposal of Fort Orange Press. Commissioner Morales seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously by a vote of all 6 Commissioners.

Mr. Ryan inquired of Mr. Suss, under the present PPB Rules there was an adjustment to weighing so heavily in favor of the lowest priced bidder. Mr. Suss stated that the Board does not have to select the lowest bidder, if we feel that the selected vendor is the best value to the city. Mr. Ryan emphasized that the Commissioners made a determination that the best value to the city was the vendor that they chose.

Hemalee Patel, the Board's General Counsel, reminded the Commissioners that the petition review hearings will begin next week on Wednesday, April 26, 2023 and Friday, April 28, 2023.

Mr. Ryan asked for a motion to set the date of the next meeting for Tuesday, April 25, 2023 at 1:30 PM.

Mr. Ryan also announced that there will be a meeting of the cover sheet review committee immediately after today's meeting, with Commissioner Umane and Commissioner Morales.

Commissioner Umane moved to set the next meeting date for Tuesday, April 25, 2023 at 1:30 PM. President Shamoun seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously.

President Shamoun moved to adjourn the meeting. Secretary Pepe-Souvenir seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously.

During the Executive Session, the following actions were taken by the unanimous decision of the Board of Commissioners:

1. Michael Watson, a Senior Voting Machine Technician, was granted 140 hours of sick time. This grant is effective March 27, 2023. Mr. Watson's agency start date is June 17, 2013;

2. Martin Badonsky, a Senior Voting Machine Technician, was granted 210 hours of sick time. This grant is effective April 13, 2023. Mr. Badonsky's agency start date is July 9, 2010;
3. Philip Ragusa, an Administrative Assistant, was granted 105 hours of sick time. This grant is effective April 17, 2023. Mr. Ragusa's agency start date is December 12, 2009;
4. Troy Johnson, a Project Coordinator, was granted 210 hours of sick time. This grant is effective April 17, 2023. Mr. Johnson's agency start date is June 10, 2004.

The meeting was adjourned.

The next stated meeting of the Commissioners is scheduled for Tuesday, April 25, 2023 at 1:30 P.M.