Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2015 3:41 PM
To: Adam Trupp
Cc: gmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; jill.zollinger@cachecounty.org; seth.oveson@carbon.utah.gov; Curtis Koch (ckoch@co.davis.ut.us); brenda@co.emery.ut.us; pati@co.juab.ut.us; mgillette@co.tooele.ut.us; mwilkins@co.uintah.ut.us; btitcomb@co.wasatch.ut.us; Ricky Hatch; vmckee@daggettcounty.org; dfreston@duchesne.utah.gov; normab@email.utcourts.gov; Lincoln Shurtz (legislative.insight@gmail.com); dcarroll@grandcountyutah.net; slafitte@hotmail.com; valeenb@hotmail.com; david@ironcounty.net; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; Ilene Roth (recorder@mail.manti.com); gcclerk@mountainwest.net; njohnson@sanjuancounty.org; sneill@sanpetecounty-ut.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; Sherrie Swensen; kentjones@summitcounty.org; Arie Van De Graaff (arie@uacnet.org); dmay@utah.gov; jaclynburt@utah.gov; justinlee@utah.gov; mjthomas@utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; Ryan Torgerson; ryan@wco.state.ut.us
Subject: Re: SB297-Marriage bill impacting Clerks-please provide input ASAP

Thanks Adam. If you can work to preserve the same structure and address the questions I raised in my 2nd email, that will go a long ways toward helping me feel comfortable with the direction the bill is going.

Bryan

>>> Adam Trupp <adam@uacnet.org> 3/9/2015 3:31 PM >>>
Great response. We will work to preserve the same structure.

Adam.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 9, 2015, at 14:51, Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov> wrote:

> We never have preformed marriages outside of business hours or offsite as a matter of practice. In terms of issuing marriage licenses I have always been and will continue to be very accommodating. If one of the parties is unable to come into the office during business hrs (usually due to military leave restrictions, or students flying home to get married on the weekend) I will meet that person after hours or on the weekend at an agreed upon location to witnesses the signature and issue the license. I have always left It is up to the couple to arrange for their own officiant in these circumstances and so far in 8 years no one has ever complained.
>
> Bryan
>
> >>> Ryan Torgerson <ryan@wayne.utah.gov> 3/9/2015 1:33 PM >>>
> I would like to see language in the bill to prevent us from having to solemnize marriages on weekends. The bill says that we have to be reasonably available to solemnize a legal marriage for which a marriage license has been issued. A lot of the time people want me to marry them on weekends and away from the office. Is this something that we can establish in our policies? Is it considered unreasonable to be asked to be available on weekends? If we refuse to do marriages on weekends and away from the office are we going to be in trouble? Do any of you perform marriages on weekends and away from the office?

Clerk may choose to be on the list, or to put an employee on it, or both, or neither. I know Utah & Weber Counties (and probably a few others) already provide a list of judges who solemnize. This option may involve some extra work to keep the list current.

2. **The Clerk designates someone as an officiant for a day, with specific authority only to perform the wedding that is being requested.** Massachusetts currently does this. Note, the designated officiant is only designated, not deputized. The process of designating would likely be providing a preprinted designation form with the officiant's name. It does not require personal action by the Clerk. Couples could bring their own officiant, who can be designated by the Clerk. This allows couples to have Grandma/best friend/boss/etc. solemnize, which would likely make the ceremony more personal and meaningful than if a stranger were to solemnize.

3. If the bill's sponsor insists that an officiant be "on call," and that ceremonies be performed on site, we may wish to point out that many counties do not perform "walk-in" ceremonies, but rather **require appointments.** Weddings are often disruptive to the Clerk's office (and often other office) functions. The Post Office and some counties require appointments for passports (often because of staffing considerations). It seems reasonable to require appointments for weddings, or to designate certain days/times when ceremonies can be solemnized on site.

4. Another option would make the wedding ceremony optional, but that idea seems not to have much traction right now.

One of the sponsor's arguments is that "government has a monopoly on marriage." This isn't completely accurate. Yes, government has a monopoly on the marriage licensing process, but definitely NOT on the marriage ceremony business. This bill, as currently written, forces Clerks into the marriage ceremony business.

It is important to keep our terminology consistent. I recommend that we refer to heterosexual marriages as "traditional marriages" and same-sex marriages as "same-sex marriages." This is widely accepted terminology.

FYI – this bill seems to be on a fast track, and is viewed as a companion bill to SB296, another anti-discrimination / religious rights bill. The Eagle Forum and Sutherland Institute fully support it. Equality Utah, Alliance for a Better Utah, and the ACLU want it amended more before moving forward, but seem hopeful that it can also become acceptable to them. Here's the link to the bill:
http://le.utah.gov/~2015/bills/static/SB0297.html

Please share your thoughts. If you'd prefer to call, please do so.

I apologize to those Clerks who have not yet received any emails on this bill. It appears that the countyclerks Listserve that I used earlier Friday isn't current.

Sorry for the loooong email!

Thanks,

R.

--

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2015 3:31 PM
To: Sanpete County Clerk; Adam Trupp
Cc: gmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; jill.zollinger@cachecounty.org; seth.oveson@carbon.utah.gov; Curtis Koch (ckoch@co.davis.ut.us); brenda@co.emery.ut.us; pati@co.juab.ut.us; mgillette@co.tooele.ut.us; mwilkins@co.uintah.ut.us; btitcomb@co.wasatch.ut.us; Ricky Hatch; vmckee@daggettcounty.org; dfreston@duchesne.utah.gov; normab@email.utcourts.gov; Lincoln Shurtz (legislative.insight@gmail.com); dcarroll@grandcountyutah.net; slafitte@hotmail.com; valeenb@hotmail.com; david@ironcounty.net; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; Ilene Roth (recorder@mail.manti.com); Maloy Dodds; njohnson@sanjuancounty.org; sneill@sanpetecounty-ut.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; Sherrie Swensen; kentjones@summitcounty.org; Arie Van De Graaff (arie@uacnet.org); dmay@utah.gov; jaclynburt@utah.gov; justinlee@utah.gov; mjthomas@utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; Ryan Torgerson; ryan@wco.state.ut.us
Subject: Re: SB297-Marriage bill impacting Clerks-please provide input ASAP

Adam,

1) Because we do not preform or solemnize any marriages in Utah County as the County Clerk's Office (we only issue the licenses), the question I have is, will this bill make it so our Office will now have to provide a reasonable accommodation for same-sex marriages that were are not currently providing for traditional marriages? Or, as long as we are providing a list of individuals that are willing to preform/ solemnize any type of marriage are we covered?

2) Also, if we can just provide a list, what if any given day or weekend no one on the list is available due to scheduling conflicts, vacation, or sickness, etc. are we still responsible to come up with other alternatives. I guess what I'm asking is,under this new bill to what extent will be required to identify someone to preform a marriage? I totally recognize my responsibility to as a County Clerk to issue a marriage license, but what is our additional scope of responsibility going to be? To see that a marriage is preformed? Preforming marriage ceremonies is a traditional service that many Clerks have provided, but under current code we are given the option.

As has been mentioned by others, our offices carry a lot of responsibilities, especially with the majority of us as Clerk/ Auditors, and the trend toward putting more responsibilities on our offices (transparency reporting, ever changing GASB reporting requirements, initiatives and referendum signature verification, and signature requirements for candidate ballot inclusion under SB54, to name a few). I just don't want us to come out on the other side of this finding out that there are increased expectations, when I personally feel everything is working just fine, and I 'm not aware of any complaints or problems that need to be addressed.

Bryan

Everyone,

I appreciate the feedback on this legislation. I have been in discussions on the language today and there are some additional amendments. I recognize there are some uncertainties about it so let me tell you this much:

1. This bill will go forward and will (almost certainly) pass this session;

Ryan Torgerson
Wayne County Clerk/Auditor

On Fri, Mar 6, 2015 at 8:59 PM, Hatch,Ricky <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us> wrote:

SB297 came out Thursday, passed through Committee on Friday, and will be discussed in the Senate early next week. It addresses anti-discrimination, allowing for some religious exemptions. It also impacts our offices.

This email summarizes how SB297 impacts Clerks, and suggests some possible amendments. PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR INPUT!

Here's how it impacts County Clerks:

- County Clerks will be required to provide couples with access to a marriage officiant.
- Clerks could not force an employee to solemnize a marriage, if doing so would go against that employee's sincere religious or deeply held beliefs.
- Other government officials who have authority to solemnize marriages would be required to either 1) agree to solemnize all marriages, regardless of whether they are traditional or same-sex, OR 2) agree not to solemnize any marriages, except for family members. "All in or all out."

The bill's intent is: if a couple wants to get married, and cannot find someone to officiate, the Clerk must provide them with access to an officiant. That officiant could be the Clerk, an employee, or any individual who is authorized to solemnize marriages (i.e., pastor, spiritual leader, judge, mayor, etc.). The officiant must be "reasonably available," which was described by the bill's sponsor as "on call."

The main issue of concern to us is whether Clerks should be forced into the marriage ceremony business. State code allows Clerks to choose whether or not to solemnize marriages. This bill forces Clerks to either solemnize marriages or to designate someone to solemnize marriages. I doubt any Clerk wants to be forced to solemnize marriages, even if they choose to solemnize - this choice should remain with the Clerk. However, the bill appears to provide Clerks with the ability to provide access to an officiant without being forced to be an officiant, and that is through the "designee" language.

Institute fully support it. Equality Utah, Alliance for a Better Utah, and the ACLU want it amended more before moving forward, but seem hopeful that it can also become acceptable to them. Here's the link to the bill: http://le.utah.gov/~2015/bills/static/SB0297.html

Please share your thoughts. If you'd prefer to call, please do so.

I apologize to those Clerks who have not yet received any emails on this bill. It appears that the countyclerks Listserve that I used earlier Friday isn't current.

Sorry for the loooong email!

Thanks,

R.

--

Ricky D. Hatch, CPA

Weber County Clerk/Auditor

Office – 801.399.8613

Mobile – 801.668.0909

--

Sandy Neill
Sanpete County Clerk

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2015 2:51 PM
To: Ricky Hatch; Ryan Torgerson
Cc: gmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; jill.zollinger@cachecounty.org; seth.oveson@carbon.utah.gov; Curtis Koch (ckoch@co.davis.ut.us); brenda@co.emery.ut.us; pati@co.juab.ut.us; mgillette@co.tooele.ut.us; mwilkins@co.uintah.ut.us; btitcomb@co.wasatch.ut.us; vmckee@daggettcounty.org; dfreston@duchesne.utah.gov; normab@email.utcourts.gov; Lincoln Shurtz (legislative.insight@gmail.com); dcarroll@grandcountyutah.net; slafitte@hotmail.com; valeenb@hotmail.com; david@ironcounty.net; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; Ilene Roth (recorder@mail.manti.com); gcclerk@mountainwest.net; njohnson@sanjuancounty.org; sneill@sanpetecounty-ut.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; Sherrie Swensen; kentjones@summitcounty.org; Adam Trupp (adam@uacnet.org); Arie Van De Graaff (arie@uacnet.org); dmay@utah.gov; jaclynburt@utah.gov; justinlee@utah.gov; mjthomas@utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; ryan@wco.state.ut.us
Subject: Re: SB297-Marriage bill impacting Clerks-please provide input ASAP

We never have preformed marriages outside of business hours or offsite as a matter of practice. In terms of issuing marriage licenses I have always been and will continue to be very accommodating. If one of the parties is unable to come into the office during business hrs (usually due to military leave restrictions, or students flying home to get married on the weekend) I will meet that person after hours or on the weekend at an agreed upon location to witnesses the signature and issue the license. I have always left It is up to the couple to arrange for their own officiant in these circumstances and so far in 8 years no one has ever complained.

Bryan

>>> Ryan Torgerson <ryan@wayne.utah.gov> 3/9/2015 1:33 PM >>>
I would like to see language in the bill to prevent us from having to solemnize marriages on weekends. The bill says that we have to be reasonably available to solemnize a legal marriage for which a marriage license has been issued. A lot of the time people want me to marry them on weekends and away from the office. Is this something that we can establish in our policies? Is it considered unreasonable to be asked to be available on weekends? If we refuse to do marriages on weekends and away from the office are we going to be in trouble? Do any of you perform marriages on weekends and away from the office?

Ryan Torgerson
Wayne County Clerk/Auditor

On Fri, Mar 6, 2015 at 8:59 PM, Hatch,Ricky <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us> wrote:

SB297 came out Thursday, passed through Committee on Friday, and will be discussed in the Senate early next week. It addresses anti-discrimination, allowing for some religious exemptions. It also impacts our offices.

This email summarizes how SB297 impacts Clerks, and suggests some possible amendments. PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR INPUT!

One of the sponsor's arguments is that "government has a monopoly on marriage." This isn't completely accurate. Yes, government has a monopoly on the marriage licensing process, but definitely NOT on the marriage ceremony business. This bill, as currently written, forces Clerks into the marriage ceremony business.

It is important to keep our terminology consistent. I recommend that we refer to heterosexual marriages as "traditional marriages" and same-sex marriages as "same-sex marriages." This is widely accepted terminology.

FYI – this bill seems to be on a fast track, and is viewed as a companion bill to SB296, another anti-discrimination / religious rights bill. The Eagle Forum and Sutherland Institute fully support it. Equality Utah, Alliance for a Better Utah, and the ACLU want it amended more before moving forward, but seem hopeful that it can also become acceptable to them. Here's the link to the bill: http://le.utah.gov/~2015/bills/static/SB0297.html

Please share your thoughts. If you'd prefer to call, please do so.

I apologize to those Clerks who have not yet received any emails on this bill. It appears that the countyclerks Listserve that I used earlier Friday isn't current.

Sorry for the loooong email!

Thanks,

R.

--

Ricky D. Hatch, CPA

Weber County Clerk/Auditor

Office – 801.399.8613

Mobile – 801.668.0909

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 8:28 AM
To: Curtis Koch; Ricky Hatch; Rozan Mitchell
Cc: Justin Lee; Mark Thomas; vsugleg@utah.gov
Subject: RE: Thatcher Bill Draft

Great thought Rozan. This is an example where we as Clerk's need to have the flexibility to determine how Voting Centers are placed. We know the unique situations for each of our individual Counties and should be allowed to use our experience accordingly.

Bryan

>>> Rozan Mitchell <RMitchell@slco.org> 1/10/2017 7:45 AM >>>
One more thought I had on this bill. The number of locations should not be a driving factor. If we were to use a location like South Towne Expo Center we could put 100 machines and 25 laptops and serve much of the population at the south end of the valley. The Maverick Center could serve all of West Valley and more. I know that Davis County applies this logic with the Davis Conference Center. It is important to look at the size of the facility and the parking more so than the actual number of locations.

Rozan Mitchell
Director of Elections
Salt Lake County Clerk
rmitchell@slco.org
385-468-7415
SLCO Clerk Website

From: Curtis Koch [mailto:ckoch@co.davis.ut.us]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2017 1:08 PM
To: Hatch,Ricky
Cc: vsugleg@utah.gov; Mark Thomas; Justin Lee
Subject: Re: Thatcher Bill Draft

Davis County does not support this bill. We believe the best way to determine the number of needed polling locations is to allow the local election administrator the flexibility to make that decision based upon the dynamics of the individual election, the behavioral pattern of the voting population and the experienced judgment of the election official.

Our Experience:

In 2014, Davis County conducted its first major by mail election and we learned a lot from that experience. We had 7 vote centers across the county. Unfortunately for us we learned that this was not sufficient and we experience unacceptably long lines at most of our polling locations (about 1 hour). We had underestimated the turnout in the election and the number of voters that would show up at the election. It was our fault, our mistake, but a mistake we won't make again.

From: Mark Thomas <mjthomas@utah.gov>
Date: 1/8/17 8:28 PM (GMT-07:00)
To: "Hatch,Ricky" <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us>
Cc: Justin Lee <justinlee@utah.gov>
Subject: [CAUTION]Fwd: Thatcher Bill Draft

Ricky,

Can you send this out to the policy committee and get their feedback? Thank you.

Mark J. Thomas
Chief Deputy/Director of Elections
Lieutenant Governor's Office
(801)538-1041

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Brian Bean <bbean@le.utah.gov>
> **Date:** January 6, 2017 at 4:06:00 PM EST
> **To:** Mark Thomas <mjthomas@utah.gov>
> **Cc:** Tom Vaughn <tvaughn@le.utah.gov>, Daniel Thatcher <dthatcher@le.utah.gov>
> **Subject: Thatcher Bill Draft**
>
> Mark,
>
> Sen. Thatcher requested that we send you a copy of his draft legislation "Polling Location Amendments." You reviewed a previous version of this bill already. Sen. Thatcher also wanted to make sure that you knew that you have permission to share this draft with the county clerks if you wish.
>
> Thanks,
>
> --
>
> Brian Bean
>
> Policy Analyst
>
> Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel
>
> 801-538-1032

##########

Michelle Blue

From: Cameron Diehl <cdiehl@ulct.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 7, 2021 2:04 PM
To: Jani Iwamoto; Hatch,Ricky
Cc: Tom Vaughn; Cowley,Ryan; Sherrie Swensen; Justin Lee
Subject: RE: Please Review: Local Election Amendments

Hello everyone,
I was out of the office for a spell and am slowly but surely getting caught up. Thanks for your patience.

The municipal clerks have two pieces of input:

Lines 68-69 referencing posting notice on the Statewide Electronic Voter Information Website. They informed me that they usually provide notice and the accompanying resolution directly to the Lt. Governor's office to post on that website. They don't have direct access to the website. Should the language require a city to notify the LG and then the LG post it on the website?

Second, UMCA is working on potential additional modifications to the noticing requirements that were in SB 201 and 1007 in the special session. They haven't finalized those recommendations yet and we haven't approached a bill sponsor. If the legislature adopted those pending recommendations, they would impact lines 76-83. Until that time, consider this paragraph simply a marker that we may need to revisit the noticing language in 76-83 at some point.

Thanks all,

Cameron

From: Jani Iwamoto <jiwamoto@le.utah.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 6, 2021 10:37 AM
To: Hatch,Ricky <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us>
Cc: Tom Vaughn <TomVaughn@le.utah.gov>; Cowley,Ryan <rcowley@co.weber.ut.us>; Sherrie Swensen <SSwensen@slco.org>; Cameron Diehl <cdiehl@ulct.org>; Justin Lee <justinlee@utah.gov>
Subject: Re: Please Review: Local Election Amendments

Great! Thank you all!!!

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 6, 2021, at 10:20 AM, Hatch,Ricky <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us> wrote:
>
> Excellent catch Ryan and thank you Tom, Sherrie, Cameron, Justin, and Sen. Iwamoto!
> R.
>
> --

From: Jani Iwamoto <jiwamoto@le.utah.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 1, 2021 9:49 PM
To: Cowley,Ryan <rcowley@co.weber.ut.us>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Please Review: Local Election Amendments

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Tom Vaughn <TomVaughn@le.utah.gov>
> **Date:** June 30, 2021 at 4:54:19 PM MDT
> **To:** "Hatch,Ricky" <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us>, sswensen@slco.org, legrand@uasd.org, Cameron Diehl <cdiehl@ulct.org>, Justin Lee <justinlee@utah.gov>
> **Cc:** Jani Iwamoto <jiwamoto@le.utah.gov>
> **Subject: RE: Please Review: Local Election Amendments**
>
> A revised version of the bill is attached. Please respond regarding whether the language works for you.

Thanks!
R.

--
Ricky Hatch, CPA, CPO
Clerk/Auditor
Weber County
2380 Washington Blvd., Suite 320 | Ogden UT | 84401 USA
E: rhatch@WeberCountyUtah.gov | P:801.399.8613 | M:801.668.0909
#WinninginWeber

Michelle Blue

From: Camille Moore <camille.moore@garfield.utah.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 10:23 AM
To: 'Hatch,Ricky'; gingermcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; tmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; lpurdum@boxeldercounty.org; jess.bradfield@cachecounty.org; justin.anderson@cachecounty.org; seth.marsing@carbon.utah.gov; Lori.Perez@carbon.utah.gov; braymond@daggettcounty.org; mhullinger@daggettcounty.org; vtanner@daggettcounty.org; ckoch@daviscountyutah.gov; bmckenzie@daviscountyutah.gov; jevans@duchesne.utah.gov; brendat@emery.utah.gov; qhall@grandcountyutah.net; janasmith@grandcountyutah.net; jwhittaker@ironcounty.net; alainal@juabcounty.gov; jant@juabcounty.gov; hnarramore@kane.utah.gov; elections@kane.utah.gov; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; tmeeks@kane.utah.gov; mrowley@co.millard.ut.us; sclark@morgan-county.net; lhyde@morgan-county.net; cmikesell@morgan-county.net; kgleave@piute.utah.gov; bpeart@richcountyut.org; Sherrie Swensen; Lannie Chapman; jdnielson@sanjuancounty.org; jfrancom@sanjuancounty.org; sneill@sanpetecountyutah.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; bacrowther@sevier.utah.gov; kentjones@summitcounty.org; krobinson@summitcounty.org; mgillette@tooeleco.org; mwilkins@uintah.utah.gov; tbruckner@uintah.utah.gov; jgranger@wasatch.utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; susan.lewis@washco.utah.gov; melaniea@washco.utah.gov; ryan@wayne.utah.gov; 'Cowley,Ryan'; 'Taylor,Lynn'; 'Wade,Daniel'; shellyjackson@utah.gov; justinlee@utah.gov
Subject: RE: Call from US Senate candidate Evan Barlow

Garfield hasn't heard from him.

From: Hatch,Ricky [mailto:rhatch@co.weber.ut.us]
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2021 12:55 PM
To: gingermcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; tmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; lpurdum@boxeldercounty.org; jess.bradfield@cachecounty.org; justin.anderson@cachecounty.org; seth.marsing@carbon.utah.gov; Lori.Perez@carbon.utah.gov; braymond@daggettcounty.org; mhullinger@daggettcounty.org; vtanner@daggettcounty.org; ckoch@daviscountyutah.gov; bmckenzie@daviscountyutah.gov; jevans@duchesne.utah.gov; brendat@emery.utah.gov; camille.moore@garfield.utah.gov; qhall@grandcountyutah.net; janasmith@grandcountyutah.net; jwhittaker@ironcounty.net; alainal@juabcounty.gov; jant@juabcounty.gov; hnarramore@kane.utah.gov; elections@kane.utah.gov; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; tmeeks@kane.utah.gov; mrowley@co.millard.ut.us; sclark@morgan-county.net; lhyde@morgan-county.net; cmikesell@morgan-county.net; kgleave@piute.utah.gov; bpeart@richcountyut.org; sswensen@slco.org; lkchapman@slco.org; jdnielson@sanjuancounty.org; jfrancom@sanjuancounty.org; sneill@sanpetecountyutah.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; bacrowther@sevier.utah.gov; kentjones@summitcounty.org; krobinson@summitcounty.org; mgillette@tooeleco.org; mwilkins@uintah.utah.gov; tbruckner@uintah.utah.gov; jgranger@wasatch.utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; susan.lewis@washco.utah.gov; melaniea@washco.utah.gov; ryan@wayne.utah.gov; Hatch,Ricky <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us>; Cowley,Ryan <rcowley@co.weber.ut.us>; Taylor,Lynn <ltaylor@co.weber.ut.us>; Wade,Daniel <DWade@co.weber.ut.us>; shellyjackson@utah.gov; justinlee@utah.gov
Subject: Call from US Senate candidate Evan Barlow

My office received a request from Evan Barlow to have a discussion. He's an independent candidate for US Senate in 2022.

Michelle Blue

From: Camille Moore <camille.moore@garfield.utah.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 10:23 AM
To: 'Hatch,Ricky'; gingermcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; tmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; lpurdum@boxeldercounty.org; jess.bradfield@cachecounty.org; justin.anderson@cachecounty.org; seth.marsing@carbon.utah.gov; Lori.Perez@carbon.utah.gov; braymond@daggettcounty.org; mhullinger@daggettcounty.org; vtanner@daggettcounty.org; ckoch@daviscountyutah.gov; bmckenzie@daviscountyutah.gov; jevans@duchesne.utah.gov; brendat@emery.utah.gov; qhall@grandcountyutah.net; janasmith@grandcountyutah.net; jwhittaker@ironcounty.net; alainal@juabcounty.gov; jant@juabcounty.gov; hnarramore@kane.utah.gov; elections@kane.utah.gov; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; tmeeks@kane.utah.gov; mrowley@co.millard.ut.us; sclark@morgan-county.net; lhyde@morgan-county.net; cmikesell@morgan-county.net; kgleave@piute.utah.gov; bpeart@richcountyut.org; Sherrie Swensen; Lannie Chapman; jdnielson@sanjuancounty.org; jfrancom@sanjuancounty.org; sneill@sanpetecountyutah.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; bacrowther@sevier.utah.gov; kentjones@summitcounty.org; krobinson@summitcounty.org; mgillette@tooeleco.org; mwilkins@uintah.utah.gov; tbruckner@uintah.utah.gov; jgranger@wasatch.utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; susan.lewis@washco.utah.gov; melaniea@washco.utah.gov; ryan@wayne.utah.gov; 'Cowley,Ryan'; 'Taylor,Lynn'; 'Wade,Daniel'; shellyjackson@utah.gov; justinlee@utah.gov
Subject: RE: Call from US Senate candidate Evan Barlow

Garfield hasn't heard from him.

From: Hatch,Ricky [mailto:rhatch@co.weber.ut.us]
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2021 12:55 PM
To: gingermcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; tmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; lpurdum@boxeldercounty.org; jess.bradfield@cachecounty.org; justin.anderson@cachecounty.org; seth.marsing@carbon.utah.gov; Lori.Perez@carbon.utah.gov; braymond@daggettcounty.org; mhullinger@daggettcounty.org; vtanner@daggettcounty.org; ckoch@daviscountyutah.gov; bmckenzie@daviscountyutah.gov; jevans@duchesne.utah.gov; brendat@emery.utah.gov; camille.moore@garfield.utah.gov; qhall@grandcountyutah.net; janasmith@grandcountyutah.net; jwhittaker@ironcounty.net; alainal@juabcounty.gov; jant@juabcounty.gov; hnarramore@kane.utah.gov; elections@kane.utah.gov; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; tmeeks@kane.utah.gov; mrowley@co.millard.ut.us; sclark@morgan-county.net; lhyde@morgan-county.net; cmikesell@morgan-county.net; kgleave@piute.utah.gov; bpeart@richcountyut.org; sswensen@slco.org; lkchapman@slco.org; jdnielson@sanjuancounty.org; jfrancom@sanjuancounty.org; sneill@sanpetecountyutah.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; bacrowther@sevier.utah.gov; kentjones@summitcounty.org; krobinson@summitcounty.org; mgillette@tooeleco.org; mwilkins@uintah.utah.gov; tbruckner@uintah.utah.gov; jgranger@wasatch.utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; susan.lewis@washco.utah.gov; melaniea@washco.utah.gov; ryan@wayne.utah.gov; Hatch,Ricky <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us>; Cowley,Ryan <rcowley@co.weber.ut.us>; Taylor,Lynn <ltaylor@co.weber.ut.us>; Wade,Daniel <DWade@co.weber.ut.us>; shellyjackson@utah.gov; justinlee@utah.gov
Subject: Call from US Senate candidate Evan Barlow

My office received a request from Evan Barlow to have a discussion. He's an independent candidate for US Senate in 2022.

Michelle Blue

From: Camille Moore <camille.moore@garfield.utah.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 4:09 PM
To: 'Hatch,Ricky'; ckoch@co.davis.ut.us; 'Cowley,Ryan'; alainal@juabcounty.com; bacrowther@sevier.utah.gov; bmckenzie@co.davis.ut.us; bpeart@richcountyut.org; braymond@daggettcounty.org; BrendaT@emery.utah.gov; bryan@uacnet.org; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; cyingling@utah.gov; datapro@manti.com; dianna.schaeffer@cachecounty.org; djessen@ironcounty.net; 'Intern,Elections'; gingermcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; jdnielson@sanjuancounty.org; jevans@duchesne.utah.gov; JGranger@wasatch.utah.gov; jjhansen@utah.gov; justin.anderson@cachecounty.org; justinlee@utah.gov; jwhittaker@ironcounty.net; kgleave@piute.utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; krobinson@summitcounty.org; Lannie Chapman; lori.perez@carbon.utah.gov; lshafer@utah.gov; markm@utah.gov; mcrook@wasatch.utah.gov; melanie.abplanalp@washco.utah.gov; mgillette@tooeleco.org; mhoward@summitcounty.org; mjackson@co.davis.ut.us; mrowley@co.millard.ut.us; mwilkins@uintah.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; rjudd@summitcounty.org; rwheeler@utah.gov; ryan@wayne.utah.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; seth.marsing@carbon.utah.gov; slafitte@morgan-county.net; slyon@sanpetecountyutah.gov; Stephen Moore; sneill@sanpetecountyutah.gov; Sherrie Swensen; Scott Tingley; Stuart Tsai; swilkerson@morgan-county.net; tduncan@uintah.utah.gov; tlake@morgan-county.net; tmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; wmcknight@wasatch.utah.gov; zeke@uacnet.org; 'Lindsey Parkinson'; qhall@grandcountyutah.net; 'Shaneal Bess'
Subject: RE: Need estimated savings amount for SB201

Garfield County averages $16,000.00 per year.

From: Hatch,Ricky [mailto:rhatch@co.weber.ut.us]
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 3:17 PM
To: ckoch@co.davis.ut.us; Cowley,Ryan <rcowley@co.weber.ut.us>; alainal@juabcounty.com; bacrowther@sevier.utah.gov; bmckenzie@co.davis.ut.us; bpeart@richcountyut.org; braymond@daggettcounty.org; BrendaT@emery.utah.gov; bryan@uacnet.org; camille.moore@garfield.utah.gov; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; cyingling@utah.gov; datapro@manti.com; dianna.schaeffer@cachecounty.org; djessen@ironcounty.net; Intern,Elections <electionintern@co.weber.ut.us>; gingermcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; jdnielson@sanjuancounty.org; jevans@duchesne.utah.gov; JGranger@wasatch.utah.gov; jjhansen@utah.gov; justin.anderson@cachecounty.org; justinlee@utah.gov; jwhittaker@ironcounty.net; kgleave@piute.utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; krobinson@summitcounty.org; lkchapman@slco.org; lori.perez@carbon.utah.gov; lshafer@utah.gov; markm@utah.gov; mcrook@wasatch.utah.gov; melanie.abplanalp@washco.utah.gov; mgillette@tooeleco.org; mhoward@summitcounty.org; mjackson@co.davis.ut.us; mrowley@co.millard.ut.us; mwilkins@uintah.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; rjudd@summitcounty.org; rwheeler@utah.gov; ryan@wayne.utah.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; seth.marsing@carbon.utah.gov; slafitte@morgan-county.net; slyon@sanpetecountyutah.gov; smoore@slco.org; sneill@sanpetecountyutah.gov; SSWENSEN@SLCO.ORG; stingley@slco.org; stsai@slco.org; swilkerson@morgan-county.net; tduncan@uintah.utah.gov; tlake@morgan-county.net; tmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; wmcknight@wasatch.utah.gov; zeke@uacnet.org; Lindsey Parkinson <lmparkinson87@gmail.com>; qhall@grandcountyutah.net; 'Shaneal Bess' <sbess@ironcounty.net>
Subject: Need estimated savings amount for SB201

For a fiscal note for SB201, we need to estimate how much money we would save by not needing to publish any notices in the local paper.

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2015 3:51 PM
To: Adam Trupp
Cc: gmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; jill.zollinger@cachecounty.org; seth.oveson@carbon.utah.gov; Curtis Koch (ckoch@co.davis.ut.us); brenda@co.emery.ut.us; pati@co.juab.ut.us; mgillette@co.tooele.ut.us; mwilkins@co.uintah.ut.us; btitcomb@co.wasatch.ut.us; Ricky Hatch; vmckee@daggettcounty.org; dfreston@duchesne.utah.gov; normab@email.utcourts.gov; Lincoln Shurtz (legislative.insight@gmail.com); Sanpete County Clerk; dcarroll@grandcountyutah.net; slafitte@hotmail.com; valeenb@hotmail.com; david@ironcounty.net; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; Ilene Roth (recorder@mail.manti.com); Maloy Dodds; njohnson@sanjuancounty.org; sneill@sanpetecounty-ut.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; Sherrie Swensen; kentjones@summitcounty.org; Arie Van De Graaff (arie@uacnet.org); dmay@utah.gov; jaclynburt@utah.gov; justinlee@utah.gov; mjthomas@utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; Ryan Torgerson; ryan@wco.state.ut.us
Subject: Re: SB297-Marriage bill impacting Clerks-please provide input ASAP

Adam,

Thanks for the additional insight and clarification. I appreciate your efforts.

Bryan

>>> Adam Trupp <adam@uacnet.org> 3/9/2015 3:43 PM >>>
Bryan,

You will have to be involved in marriages where you have not before, You will be able to develop policies that accommodate your office needs in addition to the needs of people wanting to be married. So details are not fully defined. The goal is to develop a process that enables marriages to be performed through a process that bars discriminatory conduct. I believe we will be able to create productive policies after this bill is adopted.

I will be glad to discuss details when we have a little more time.

Adam

On Mar 9, 2015, at 3:31 PM, Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov> wrote:

> Adam,
>
> 1) Because we do not preform or solemnize any marriages in Utah County as the County Clerk's Office (we only issue the licenses), the question I have is, will this bill make it so our Office will now have to provide a reasonable accommodation for same-sex marriages that were are not currently providing for traditional marriages? Or, as long as we are providing a list of individuals that are willing to preform/ solemnize any type of marriage are we covered?

Our office performs marriages on weekends and away from the office if it fits our schedule.We charge a minimum of $50 for the ceremony when it is during off hours or away from the office. Some locations in the county (up in the mountains) take more time to get to, so we let them know the fee could be higher. If we perform a ceremony in our building during business hours, we charge $20.

Couples need to plan in advance. This is just one part of a marriage celebration. They wouldn't expect a bakery to have a cake ready with no notice. They wouldn't want to walk into a jewelry store and grab the first ring they see whether it fits or not. Why should we make a law that says we will always have someone available without notice to perform a ceremony? We have a very small staff, and my full-time deputy clerk and I both perform ceremonies. What happens if we are short-staffed, and have a busy schedule? How many back up people in the community would we need to have to be sure one of them is available?

When people call to see who can perform marriages, we give them the information for our judges, mayors,our office, and explain that the local clergy can also perform ceremonies. Then we have them make their own arrangements.

On Mon, Mar 9, 2015 at 1:33 PM, Ryan Torgerson <ryan@wayne.utah.gov> wrote:
I would like to see language in the bill to prevent us from having to solemnize marriages on weekends. The bill says that we have to be reasonably available to solemnize a legal marriage for which a marriage license has been issued. A lot of the time people want me to marry them on weekends and away from the office. Is this something that we can establish in our policies? Is it considered unreasonable to be asked to be available on weekends? If we refuse to do marriages on weekends and away from the office are we going to be in trouble? Do any of you perform marriages on weekends and away from the office?

Ryan Torgerson
Wayne County Clerk/Auditor

On Fri, Mar 6, 2015 at 8:59 PM, Hatch,Ricky <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us> wrote:

SB297 came out Thursday, passed through Committee on Friday, and will be discussed in the Senate early next week. It addresses anti-discrimination, allowing for some religious exemptions. It also impacts our offices.

This email summarizes how SB297 impacts Clerks, and suggests some possible amendments. PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR INPUT!

Here's how it impacts County Clerks:

- County Clerks will be required to provide couples with access to a marriage officiant.

2. **The Clerk designates someone as an officiant for a day, with specific authority only to perform the wedding that is being requested.** Massachusetts currently does this. Note, the designated officiant is only designated, not deputized. The process of designating would likely be providing a preprinted designation form with the officiant's name. It does not require personal action by the Clerk. Couples could bring their own officiant, who can be designated by the Clerk. This allows couples to have Grandma/best friend/boss/etc. solemnize, which would likely make the ceremony more personal and meaningful than if a stranger were to solemnize.

3. If the bill's sponsor insists that an officiant be "on call," and that ceremonies be performed on site, we may wish to point out that many counties do not perform "walk-in" ceremonies, but rather **require appointments.** Weddings are often disruptive to the Clerk's office (and often other office) functions. The Post Office and some counties require appointments for passports (often because of staffing considerations). It seems reasonable to require appointments for weddings, or to designate certain days/times when ceremonies can be solemnized on site.

4. Another option would make the wedding ceremony optional, but that idea seems not to have much traction right now.

One of the sponsor's arguments is that "government has a monopoly on marriage.." This isn't completely accurate. Yes, government has a monopoly on the marriage licensing process, but definitely NOT on the marriage ceremony business. This bill, as currently written, forces Clerks into the marriage ceremony business.

It is important to keep our terminology consistent. I recommend that we refer to heterosexual marriages as "traditional marriages" and same-sex marriages as "same-sex marriages." This is widely accepted terminology.

FYI – this bill seems to be on a fast track, and is viewed as a companion bill to SB296, another anti-discrimination / religious rights bill. The Eagle Forum and Sutherland Institute fully support it. Equality Utah, Alliance for a Better Utah, and the ACLU want it amended more before moving forward, but seem hopeful that it can also become acceptable to them. Here's the link to the bill: http://le.utah.gov/~2015/bills/static/SB0297.html

Please share your thoughts. If you'd prefer to call, please do so.

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2015 4:51 PM
To: Sherrie Swensen; Adam Trupp
Cc: gmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; jill.zollinger@cachecounty.org; seth.oveson@carbon.utah.gov; Curtis Koch; brenda@co.emery.ut.us; pati@co.juab.ut.us; mgillette@co.tooele.ut.us; mwilkins@co.uintah.ut.us; btitcomb@co.wasatch.ut.us; RickyHatch <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us> (rhatch@co.weber.ut.us); vmckee@daggettcounty.org; dfreston@duchesne.utah.gov; normab@email.utcourts.gov; Lincoln Shurtz; dcarroll@grandcountyutah.net; slafitte@hotmail.com; valeenb@hotmail.com; david@ironcounty.net; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; Ilene Roth; njohnson@sanjuancounty.org; sneill@sanpetecounty-ut.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; Dahnelle Burton-Lee; Paula Smith; kentjones@summitcounty.org; Arie Van DeGraaff; dmay@utah.gov; jaclynburt@utah.gov; justinlee@utah.gov; mjthomas@utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; ryan@wco.state.ut.us
Subject: RE: SB297-Marriage bill impacting Clerks-please provide input ASAP

I like the suggestion that Sherrie has made also. I think it helps define the structure we as Clerks are looking for.

Bryan

>>> Sherrie Swensen <SSwensen@slco.org> 3/9/2015 4:43 PM >>>
Hi Adam,

Salt Lake County offers wedding ceremonies by appointment during regular business hours. We don't offer ceremonies during lunch hours and after 4:00 pm because of staffing shortages. Occasionally, we will do a walk-in ceremony if the wedding room is available. I am concerned that the language in the bill is vague as to what is expected of the clerk's offices. We do not make arrangements for wedding ceremonies outside of our office or our business hours and I don't think we should be expected to. We provide a list of officiators who will perform wedding ceremonies outside the office and office hours and it is up to the couple to find someone.

We are currently booked every Friday through April 3th and most other days up until then. We are busier than ever before. (For example, we performed 2,166 wedding ceremonies in 2014 compared to 1,992 in 2013.) I read in the Tribune that Rep. Urquhart said *"The way I see Stuart's bill working in the marriage arena is someone will show up to a clerk's office... and the clerk's office will smile and say, 'Great, let's get you married.'"* That isn't feasible and they need to know it. Between issuing marriage licenses, passports and performing marriage ceremonies, my staff is overextended now.

I asked our legal counsel to review SB 297 and she suggested the following language be included to remedy some of my concerns. Below is her input and I agree with her idea to amend the bill to read, *"during the clerk's office hours"*. She said:

"The issue is created by the changes to 17-20-4(2) and the introductory language.

17-20-4(2) says the clerk shall "establish policies to ensure that the county clerk or the county clerk's designee is reasonably available to solemnize a legal marriage for which a marriage license has been issued."

That being said, I think the bill will provide a new requirement for Clerks but also will provide a lot of room to determine what will be done in any county. The fact is that the policy that will be created can be defined by local realities so long as they fit within the intent of the law. Meaning, if you have some people designated in your county who will perform all legal marriages then you can set some limitations (of the type Sandy refers to). What you cannot do, is to refuse to perform marriages or fail to have someone available to perform a legal marriage under reasonable circumstances.

The question is, can we do this? I have said we can find a way to do it.

The bill is still being amended. My goal is to give you as much room to move as possible while enabling the goal of the bill which is to create a civil mechanism for marriages that are legal.

I will keep you up to date as things develop.

Adam

On Mar 9, 2015, at 2:03 PM, Sanpete County Clerk <sancoclerk@gmail.com> wrote:

Our office performs marriages on weekends and away from the office if it fits our schedule.We charge a minimum of $50 for the ceremony when it is during off hours or away from the office. Some locations in the county (up in the mountains) take more time to get to, so we let them know the fee could be higher. If we perform a ceremony in our building during business hours, we charge $20.

Couples need to plan in advance. This is just one part of a marriage celebration. They wouldn't expect a bakery to have a cake ready with no notice. They wouldn't want to walk into a jewelry store and grab the first ring they see whether it fits or not. Why should we make a law that says we will always have someone available without notice to perform a ceremony? We have a very small staff, and my full-time deputy clerk and I both perform ceremonies. What happens if we are short-staffed, and have a busy schedule? How many back up people in the community would we need to have to be sure one of them is available?

When people call to see who can perform marriages, we give them the information for our judges, mayors,our office, and explain that the local clergy can also perform ceremonies. Then we have them make their own arrangements.

On Mon, Mar 9, 2015 at 1:33 PM, Ryan Torgerson <ryan@wayne.utah.gov> wrote:
I would like to see language in the bill to prevent us from having to solemnize marriages on weekends. The bill says that we have to be reasonably available to solemnize a legal marriage for which a marriage license has been issued. A lot of the time people want me to marry them on weekends and away from the office. Is this something that we can establish in our policies? Is it considered unreasonable to be asked to be available on weekends? If we refuse to do marriages on weekends and away from the office are we going to be in trouble? Do any of you perform marriages on weekends and away from the office?

Ryan Torgerson
Wayne County Clerk/Auditor

On Fri, Mar 6, 2015 at 8:59 PM, Hatch,Ricky <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us> wrote:

them.. The Clerk may choose to be on the list, or to put an employee on it, or both, or neither. I know Utah & Weber Counties (and probably a few others) already provide a list of judges who solemnize. This option may involve some extra work to keep the list current.

2. **The Clerk designates someone as an officiant for a day, with specific authority only to perform the wedding that is being requested.** Massachusetts currently does this. Note, the designated officiant is only designated, not deputized. The process of designating would likely be providing a preprinted designation form with the officiant's name. It does not require personal action by the Clerk. Couples could bring their own officiant, who can be designated by the Clerk. This allows couples to have Grandma/best friend/boss/etc. solemnize, which would likely make the ceremony more personal and meaningful than if a stranger were to solemnize.

3. If the bill's sponsor insists that an officiant be "on call," and that ceremonies be performed on site, we may wish to point out that many counties do not perform "walk-in" ceremonies, but rather **require appointments.** Weddings are often disruptive to the Clerk's office (and often other office) functions. The Post Office and some counties require appointments for passports (often because of staffing considerations). It seems reasonable to require appointments for weddings, or to designate certain days/times when ceremonies can be solemnized on site.

4. Another option would make the wedding ceremony optional, but that idea seems not to have much traction right now.

One of the sponsor's arguments is that "government has a monopoly on marriage.." This isn't completely accurate. Yes, government has a monopoly on the marriage licensing process, but definitely NOT on the marriage ceremony business. This bill, as currently written, forces Clerks into the marriage ceremony business.

It is important to keep our terminology consistent. I recommend that we refer to heterosexual marriages as "traditional marriages" and same-sex marriages as "same-sex marriages." This is widely accepted terminology.

FYI – this bill seems to be on a fast track, and is viewed as a companion bill to SB296, another anti-discrimination / religious rights bill. The Eagle Forum and Sutherland Institute fully support it. Equality Utah, Alliance for a Better Utah, and the ACLU want it amended more before moving forward, but seem hopeful that it can also become acceptable to them. Here's the link to the bill: http://le.utah.gov/~2015/bills/static/SB0297.html

Please share your thoughts. If you'd prefer to call, please do so.

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2015 4:32 PM
To: Ricky Hatch; Ryan Torgerson
Cc: gmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; myoung@boxeldercounty.org; jill.zollinger@cachecounty.org; seth.oveson@carbon.utah.gov; Curtis Koch(ckoch@co.davis.ut.us); brenda@co.emery.ut.us; pati@co.juab.ut.us; mgillette@co.tooele.ut.us; mwilkins@co.uintah.ut.us; btitcomb@co.wasatch.ut.us; vmckee@daggettcounty.org; dfreston@duchesne.utah.gov; normab@email.utcourts.gov; Lincoln Shurtz(legislative.insight@gmail.com); dcarroll@grandcountyutah.net; slafitte@hotmail.com; valeenb@hotmail.com; david@ironcounty.net; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; Ilene Roth(recorder@mail.manti.com); gcclerk@mountainwest.net; njohnson@sanjuancounty.org; sneill@sanpetecounty-ut.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; Sherrie Swensen; kentjones@summitcounty.org; Adam Trupp (adam@uacnet.org); Arie Van De Graaff (arie@uacnet.org); dmay@utah.gov; jaclynburt@utah.gov; justinlee@utah.gov; mjthomas@utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; ryan@wco.state.ut.us
Subject: Re: SB297-Marriage bill - An agreeable solution!

Ricky,

I appreciate the summation you have provided. If the 3 points you listed are incorporated, I feel that my concerns have been addressed.

Thanks to all who have been watching this closely and providing the input to Senator Adams and those involved in writing the bill's language.

Bryan

>>> "Hatch,Ricky" <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us> 3/9/2015 4:16 PM >>>
Thanks everyone for your comments. Here's some good news:

Adam has been working with me, Senator Adams, and other parties, with the goal to leave each county enough room to develop policies that fit our local needs. Here are the highlights of what we think will be incorporated into the bill:

1. The bill will require that every county clerk designate a person or persons in the area who will perform any legal marriage. This person does not need to be an employee. It does need to be a person who will perform any legal marriage (they cannot perform some types of marriages but not others).
2. The marriage ceremony does not need to be on demand, nor does it need to be provided on county property, nor coordinated by county staff.
3. The bill will not set many parameters about who the designees need to be or where they are, so our policies can be drawn to meet local needs. What must be provided, however, is the opportunity for anyone granted a marriage license to obtain a solemnization in any county in the state. If we make that possible, we have a good deal of leeway on how we write policy.

This bill has a full head of steam, and the clerks' issue is not really a big sticking point with any party. The points list above will help ensure that anybody who wants to get married will have an avenue to get married, but that Clerks will not have to be in the marriage ceremony business, if we don't want to be. It's an excellent balance.

This email summarizes how SB297 impacts Clerks, and suggests some possible amendments. PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR INPUT!

Here's how it impacts County Clerks:

- County Clerks will be required to provide couples with access to a marriage officiant.

- Clerks could not force an employee to solemnize a marriage, if doing so would go against that employee's sincere religious or deeply held beliefs.

- Other government officials who have authority to solemnize marriages would be required to either 1) agree to solemnize all marriages, regardless of whether they are traditional or same-sex, OR 2) agree not to solemnize any marriages, except for family members. "All in or all out."

The bill's intent is: if a couple wants to get married, and cannot find someone to officiate, the Clerk must provide them with access to an officiant. That officiant could be the Clerk, an employee, or any individual who is authorized to solemnize marriages (i.e., pastor, spiritual leader, judge, mayor, etc.). The officiant must be "reasonably available," which was described by the bill's sponsor as "on call."

The main issue of concern to us is whether Clerks should be forced into the marriage ceremony business. State code allows Clerks to choose whether or not to solemnize marriages. This bill forces Clerks to either solemnize marriages or to designate someone to solemnize marriages. I doubt any Clerk wants to be forced to solemnize marriages, even if they choose to solemnize - this choice should remain with the Clerk. However, the bill appears to provide Clerks with the ability to provide access to an officiant without being forced to be an officiant, and that is through the "designee" language.

The bill's sponsor said he is willing to work with Clerks to address our concerns. The bill says that the Clerk must establish a "policy to ensure that the Clerk or the Clerk's designee is reasonably available to solemnize."

Here are some possible amendments that might satisfy all parties:

1. **The Clerk provides a contact list of "designated officiants" to applicants.** These officiants must agree to comply with state code governing marriages, and to be "reasonably available" to solemnize marriages. The couple can then contact their desired designated officiant, and schedule the ceremony directly with them. The Clerk may choose to be on the list, or to put an employee on it, or both, or neither. I know Utah & Weber Counties (and probably a few others) already provide a list of judges who solemnize. This option may involve some extra work to keep the list current.

2. **The Clerk designates someone as an officiant for a day, with specific authority only to perform the wedding that is being requested.** Massachusetts currently does this. Note, the designated officiant is only designated, not deputized. The process of designating would likely be providing a preprinted designation form with the officiant's name. It does not require personal action by the Clerk. Couples could bring their own officiant, who can be designated by the Clerk. This allows couples to have Grandma/best friend/boss/etc. solemnize, which would likely make the ceremony more personal and meaningful than if a stranger were to solemnize.

3. If the bill's sponsor insists that an officiant be "on call," and that ceremonies be performed on site, we may wish to point out that many counties do not perform "walk-in" ceremonies, but rather **require appointments.** Weddings are often disruptive to the Clerk's office (and often other office) functions. The Post Office and some counties require appointments for passports (often because of staffing considerations). It seems reasonable to require appointments for weddings, or to designate certain days/times when ceremonies can be solemnized on site.

4. Another option would make the wedding ceremony optional, but that idea seems not to have much traction right now.

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 4:20 PM
To: Derek Brenchley; Brent R. Titcomb; Mark Thomas; Pam Tueller; Diana Carroll; Brenda; Rozan Mitchell; Sherrie Swensen; Seth Oveson; Nielson, John David; Scott Hogensen; Justin Lee (Google Drive)
Subject: RE: Sample Letter to Unaffiliated Voters

Utah County will not be sending a letter out.

Bryan

From: Derek Brenchley [mailto:dbrenchley@utah.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 4:19 PM
To: Brent R. Titcomb <btitcomb@wasatch.utah.gov>; Mark Thomas <mjthomas@utah.gov>; Pam Tueller <PTueller@slco.org>; Diana Carroll <dcarroll@grandcountyutah.net>; Brenda <brendat@emery.utah.gov>; Rozan Mitchell <rmitchell@slco.org>; Sherrie Swensen <sswensen@slco.org>; Seth Oveson <Seth.Oveson@carbon.utah.gov>; Nielson, John David <jdnielson@sanjuancounty.org>; Scott Hogensen <ScottCH@utahcounty.gov>; Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>; Justin Lee (Google Drive) <justinlee@utah.gov>
Subject: Re: Sample Letter to Unaffiliated Voters

Hello all,

We received some feedback on the example we provided, and we're going to make some changes. Before we make those changes, we wanted to know who, if anyone, is planning on sending out a letter.

Thanks,
Derek

On Wed, Jun 21, 2017 at 3:02 PM, Derek Brenchley <dbrenchley@utah.gov> wrote:

> Good afternoon all,
>
> Attached is a sample letter you can mail to your unaffiliated voters prior to the Primary Election. You are not required to use this format or even send a letter at all, but we thought this may be helpful. Please let us know if you have any questions.
>
> Best,
> Derek Brenchley
>
> --
> Utah Lieutenant Governor's Office
> 801-538-1501

--
Utah Lieutenant Governor's Office

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Rodgers <bryan@uacnet.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 5:26 PM
To: Ricky Hatch
Cc: Sherrie Swensen; Pam Tueller; justinlee@utah.gov
Subject: Re: OK to testify in House Gov Ops Friday afternoon?

Yes I can give the quick UAC supports message again.

Sincerely,

Bryan Rodgers, Intergovernmental Relations

Utah Association of Counties

5397 South Vine Street
Murray, Utah 84107

C: (801)-631-4822

O: (801)-727-3160

On Thu, Feb 21, 2019, 5:24 PM Hatch,Ricky <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us> wrote:

> We have two bills that the clerks support. Are you OK stating that the clerk's group and UAC support both bills? Justin and/or SLCo can address the benefits of SB61. SB62 is more of an LG cleanup bill, but I think it's good to have an additional person testify, and UAC's weight.
>
> Sherrie/Pam, were either of you planning to testify for SB61?
>
> R.
>
> Ricky Hatch, CPA, CPO
>
> Clerk/Auditor
>
> Weber County
>
> 2380 Washington Blvd., Suite 320 | Ogden UT | 84401 USA
>
> E: rhatch@WeberCountyUtah.gov | P:801.399.8613 | M:801.668.0909
>
> #WinninginWeber

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2017 10:16 AM
To: Mark Mitchell; Seth Oveson; Rozan Mitchell; Sherrie Swensen
Cc: Justin Lee; Derek Brenchley
Subject: RE: Election Results Today

Mark,

We will have a release today. We should have it to you by 11am this morning. We will let you know when we send it so you can make sure it got there.

Bryan

From: Mark Mitchell [mailto:markm@utah.gov]
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2017 10:11 AM
To: Seth Oveson <seth.oveson@carbon.utah.gov>; Rozan Mitchell <RMitchell@slco.org>; Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>; Sherrie Swensen <sswensen@slco.org>
Cc: Justin Lee <justinlee@utah.gov>; Derek Brenchley <dbrenchley@utah.gov>
Subject: Election Results Today

Good morning!

Will you please let us know as soon as possible whether or not you plan to release results today? If so, please make sure your file is uploaded via VISTA before 3pm.

Thanks so much,

Mark B. Mitchell
IT Director, Lt. Governor's Office
Utah Dept. of Technology Services
markm@utah.gov
(801) 538-9581

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2016 11:29 AM
To: Ricky Hatch; vsug@utah.gov
Cc: Arie Van De Graaff (arie@uacnet.org); justinlee@utah.gov; mjthomas@utah.gov
Subject: Re: Please reply: is your county doing Vote By Mail or Traditional this year?

Utah County is doing the Traditional polling place format for 2016. We are also promoting absentee voting for those that want that convenience. Our theme for 2016 "You have options" Absentee, Early Vote, or Traditional at your neighborhood polling location.

Bryan

>>> "Hatch,Ricky" <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us> 3/24/2016 11:12 AM >>>
We're putting together a list of counties that are doing their elections all by mail this year.

Please let me know if your county is doing VBM or Traditional polling place format.

Once I have the full list, I'll share with everyone, so we know who is doing what.

Also – if you would like to see ES&S's new voting equipment in action, they are running the convention elections for the Weber County Democratic Party **this Saturday** at 10 AM at Ogden High School. This is a great chance to watch the equipment in an "actual" election, not a pre-programmed demo. If you want more info, email me or Ryan Cowley (rcowley@co.weber.ut.us).

Thanks!
R.

--
Ricky D. Hatch, CPA
Weber County Clerk/Auditor
Office – 801.399.8613
Mobile – 801.668.0909

--

--

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2016 12:09 PM
To: Ricky Hatch; Mark Thomas
Cc: Rozan Mitchell; Arie Van De Graaff (arie@uacnet.org); justinlee@utah.gov; vsugleg@utah.gov
Subject: Re: Please review this bill & provide feedback- Disposition of Ballots - Eliason, S.

Mark,

Thanks for the follow-up on the items associated with this bill. Adding voter contact information would definitely be helpful.

I just wanted to let everyone know I have reservations about requiring a 1 day turn around for notification. I know that timely notification of ballot issues is important. I just don't like the constraint that it places on me and my staff. Why 1 business day, and not within 3 business days (or something like that) to give us some flexibility to adjust to our own unique circumstances.

I'm seeing a growing trend to require more of us as County Clerk's during the already tight election time frame. The increased need for trained staff during the election window of 30 days in advance (ballot mailing) to two weeks after (canvas) Election Day introduces additional challenges.

I know that this issue has been up for discussion or the past few weeks, and I apologize that I have not spoke up sooner. I just did not realize that we had a problem that needed to fixed as it relates to this issue.

Bryan Thompson
Utah County

>>> Mark Thomas <mjthomas@utah.gov> 1/25/2016 11:28 AM >>>
Since Rep. Eliason's bill will require you to notify voters within 1 business day, would it be helpful to add language in his bill that would allow the voter the option put add their phone number and/or email on the ballot envelop?

I know some of you have already added this contact information to the ballot envelop, but I'm wondering if it would be helpful to solidify that in statute.

Let me know what you think on adding this language.

Also- Rep. Eliason is happy to change the bill to one business day. We can also add this feature to VISTA to make it quicker.

Mark J. Thomas
Chief Deputy/Director of Elections
Lieutenant Governor's Office
Utah State Capitol, Suite 200

Cc: Arie Van De Graaff (arie@uacnet.org); mjthomas@utah.gov; justinlee@utah.gov
Subject: Please review this bill & provide feedback- Disposition of Ballots - Eliason, S.

Hey everyone,

Please look at this bill and provide feedback. It's short. Look at lines 66-77.

Basically, the bill adds that we provide voters with notice that their by mail ballot was rejected within 24-hours of rejecting it, and gives the voter a chance to remedy the rejection before polls close on election day.

If we reject a ballot that was received **on** election day, we have up to seven days after election day to notify the voter (this part gives us more leeway than before).

If we reject a ballot that was received **after** election day, we have up to seven days after the canvass to notify the voter (this part didn't change).

I think the bill is good to support, although we probably should change the "24-hour" notice requirement to "one business day" (to account for weekends and holidays – we shouldn't be required to notify a voter on a Saturday if we reject their ballot on Friday).

Please let me know your thoughts. There are several more bills out there. We'll start discussing them early in January, right during our "intent to gather signatures" fracas.

Thanks!

R.

--

Carpe Diem

From: Mark Thomas [mailto:mjthomas@utah.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2015 5:11 PM
To: Hatch,Ricky
Cc: Lee, Justin
Subject: Fwd: 2016FL0436_003 - 2016FL0436 (Protected) version 3 - Disposition of Ballots - Eliason, S.

Hi Ricky,

Do you want to get feedback from the group on this proposed bill?

Mark J. Thomas

Chief Deputy/Director of Elections

Lieutenant Governor's Office

Utah State Capitol, Suite 200

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 6, 2016 5:57 PM
To: Ricky Hatch; Justin Lee; vsug@utah.gov
Subject: RE: Releasing Election Results Draft Guidelines

Ricky,

I think your summary hits the key concerns and I add a 2nd to what you stated.

Bryan

>>> "Hatch,Ricky" <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us> 6/6/2016 3:51 PM >>>
Thanks for the email, Justin, and for seeking feedback. Here are some thoughts:

- I thought we had discussed the release dates at our spring conference, and decided to release on Friday & Tuesday? I know some counties are closed on Friday, but what I remember is that they said they'd probably be working on the Friday after Election Day anyway, so it wouldn't be a big deal for them.
- To release on Thursday creates a really tight deadline, especially for larger counties, or counties that receive a large amount of paper ballots in the mail or dropped off at polling places on Election Day. Granted, we don't know what the Primary will bring as far as turnout but it's only three weeks away, and if we release on Thursday for the primary, the precedent will be set for the general & future elections, when a Thursday release would be more challenging, nearly impossible.
- This is what we fought against with Rep. Eliason's bill last session. He wanted us to release on Wednesday. We said, "Impossible." He suggested Thursday, and we said that was still too tight. He didn't want to codify a Friday release, so he agreed to leave it simply as the day we counted, with the understanding that the release would be on Friday. I believe this was also mentioned during the committee hearing.
- The Veterans Day is an issue only once every few years, and we would most likely be working on that day anyway, especially this year.
- Finally, it might actually be a good thing to release the results on a slow-news Friday afternoon, especially with a close election. One of the reasons we didn't like phased releases in the first place was the potential for news stories reporting every election result change, prompting unnecessary calls to our office, or creating more confusion or mistrust if the winner changes during the interim counting process. And generally, the people who really want to know will check our websites rather than the paper.

Keeping the Friday/Tuesday schedule seems to be the best solution, IMHO.

Thanks,
R.
--
Carpe Diem

From: Justin Lee [mailto:justinlee@utah.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 06, 2016 10:59 AM
Subject: Re: Releasing Election Results Draft Guidelines

Good Morning,

provisional ballots, processing by mail ballots and conducting an audit. We also understand that it is much more efficient to process ballots in large batches every few days than in small batches every day.

As this legislation was discussed at the Utah Association of Counties meeting on Friday, April 15 there seemed to be a consensus that the Lt. Governor's Office should provide guidelines to the county clerks that would set forth a unified schedule for counting and releasing election results. I have attached a draft of those guidelines. This will help our office as we try and manage the continual release of results, but more importantly will help the public, as they can expect when the election results will be released.

Before we set forth this guideline, we want to get your input on a proposed schedule. Keeping in mind the work that needs to be done in the days after the election and a desire to release results in a manner that will be consistent across the state we propose that after election day ballots be counted and results released on the Friday after election day, the following Tuesday, the following Friday and finally on Canvass Day.

For the 2016 Primary Election that means ballots would be counted and results released on:

Tuesday, June 28
Friday, July 1
Tuesday, July 5
Friday, July 8
Tuesday, July 12

For the 2016 General Election that means ballots would be counted and results released on:

Tuesday, November 8
Friday, November 11
Tuesday, November 15
Friday, November 18
Tuesday, November 22

To help the public know when to expect results we also propose that those results be released between 12:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. on those days.

H.B. 21 also provides that if releasing results on any day will result in the disclosure of a voter's vote the election officer can request permission from the Lt. Governor to delay releasing results until enough ballots can be counted to protect a voter's vote from being disclosed. If your county has *less than 20 ballots counted on a given day* you can consider that permission to withhold releasing those results is granted. If you run into any other situation where you feel the privacy of a voter's vote could be compromised we will deal with those on a case by case basis.

Finally, for previous elections we have only asked that you send us election results on election night. With this new law we are asking that you send us the election results each time you release them so that we can update the totals on the statewide election results web page. This will give voters and media one site they can visit to get all updated results.

If you have any issues or suggestion for this proposal please let us know by Wednesday, June 8. Once we get feedback from you we will officially put out these guidelines from our office.

Michelle Blue

From: Bryan Thompson <BryanT@utahcounty.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 5, 2016 9:42 AM
To: Justin Lee; VSUsersGroup Voting-Systems-Users-Group
Cc: Scott Hogensen
Subject: Re: Releasing Election Results Today

Justin,

Utah County will not be releasing results today. With the long weekend, we have not run any additional batches since our last release on Friday.

Bryan

>>> Justin Lee <justinlee@utah.gov> 7/5/2016 9:17 AM >>>
Good Morning,

If your county does not plan on counting and releasing results today please let me know before noon.

Thanks,
Justin

Justin Lee
Deputy Director of Elections
Office of the Lieutenant Governor
State of Utah
801.538.1129
justinlee@utah.gov

--
You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "vsug@utah.gov" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to vsug+unsubscribe@utah.gov.

Michelle Blue

From: Brian Newby <BNewby@eac.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 12, 2018 7:32 PM
To: apmiller@dcboe.org; astarling@tnaflcio.org; Anthony.Stevens@sos.nh.gov; auditor@co.jasper.ia.us; Aulii.c.tenn@hawaii.gov; bgoeckner@outlook.com; bking@iec.in.gov; bmatthews@elections.il.gov; bmosley@lafayettecoms.com; bpkemp@sos.ga.gov; bryan.caskey@sos.ks.gov; BuckhouseD@casscountynd.gov; BWestfall@wvsos.com; bwood@putnamwv.org; carol.morris@elections.ok.gov; carol.olson@sos.iowa.gov; carol.thompson@alaska.gov; chrissy.peters@sos.mo.gov; countyclerk@jeffersoncountyclerk.org; cpekron@qgtlaw.com; DCorson@mt.gov; debby.erickson@crowwing.us; derrin.robinson@co.harney.or.us; dkunko@co.chaves.nm.us; dorsetclerk@gmail.com; douglas.kellner@elections.ny.gov; dousan@oklahomacounty.org; dshively@lancaster.ne.gov; dwight.shellman@sos.state.co.us; elaine.manlove@state.de.us; elections@cobma.us; elections@traviscountytx.gov; espencer@azsos.gov; fiti.tavai@gmail.com; gary.poser@state.mn.us; genevieve.whitaker@vi.gov; Griddlemoser@staffordcountyva.gov; HARSMANS@mcohio.org; Hawley.robertson@sos.ms.gov; howard.sholl@state.de.us; Howell@sos.mo.gov; jacksoncountyclerk@gmail.com; jerry.pettit@co.kittitas.wa.us; jgonzales@co.albany.wy.us; jmarks@pa.gov; joe.iseke@gec.guam.gov; John.Merrill@sos.Alabama.gov; josie.bahnke@alaska.gov; jpg@ClarkCountyNV.gov; JRoncelli@Bloomfieldtwp.org; jsilrum@nd.gov; julie.flynn@maine.gov; justinlee@utah.gov; jwendland@SOS.NV.gov; kai.schon@wyo.gov; Kari.Fresquez@state.nm.us; katie.brown@maryland.gov; kingram@sos.texas.gov; KLJ@portlandmaine.gov; Kristin.Gabriel@state.sd.us; lbailey@augustaga.gov; lealofi.uiagalelei@eo.as.gov; lgough@earthlink.net; lhmoor@hotamail.com; ljperret@lpclerk.com; LPhaneuf@Burrillville.org; lvonnessi@aol.com; marci@elections.sc.gov; Maria.Matthews@DOS.myflorida.com; maria.pangelinan@gec.guam.gov; Mark.Goins@tn.gov; maryellen.allen@ky.gov; Mellette@goldenwest.net; mgill@dcboe.org; Michael.Dickerson@mecklenburgcountync.gov; michael.haas@wi.gov; Michelle.Tassinari@sec.state.ma.us; Neal.kelley@rov.ocgov.com; nikki.charlson@maryland.gov; pattyweeks@co.nezperce.id.us; peggy.reeves@ct.gov; plux@co.okaloosa.fl.us; pwolfe@ohiosecretaryofstate.gov; rachel.bledi@albanycounty.com; rallende@cee.gobierno.pr; rmoore@cascadecountymt.gov; Robert.Giles@sos.nj.gov; robertd@pointing.com; rrock@sos.ri.gov; rsantos@co.weld.co.us; rvalenzuela@risc.maricopa.gov; sbrewer@co.butler.pa.us; Shirley.magarifuji@mauicounty.us; SLapsley@sos.ca.gov; Sherrie Swensen; Steve.trout@state.or.us; stevenreed@mc-ala.org; stuart.holmes@sos.wa.gov; tdecarlo@waterburyct.org; thurst@sos.idaho.gov; TR_county_clerk@wan.kdor.state.ks.us; trethlake@co.st-joseph.in.us; veronica.degraffenreid@ncsbe.gov; wanda.hemphill@yorkcountygov.com; WaValez@cee.gobierno.pr; will.senning@sec.state.vt.us; WilliamsS1@michigan.gov
Cc: Christy McCormick; Robin Sargent; Cliff Tatum
Subject: Standards Board Updates
Attachments: EAC Standards Board VVSG Resolution 2018-01.doc; ATT00001.htm; 2018 Standards Board DRAFT Agenda 12.28.17 Update 7.doc; ATT00002.htm

On behalf of Commissioner Christy McCormick, the Designated Federal Officer for EAC's Standards Board, please see the following important note, followed by some additional updates:

detailed technical procedures and standards employed to conduct the certification of voting systems under "Voluntary Voting System Guidelines 2.0".

(3) The requirement under Section 311(c) of HAVA that the United States Election Assistance Commission review and update recommendations adopted with respect to voting system standards no less frequently than once every 4 years.

MOTION CARRIED

A True Record Attest:

Jerry Schwarting
Secretary of the Standards Board
Executive Board

Submitted by: J. Bradley King

Approved as to Form by Resolution committee _____

Submitted to the Standards Board for Approval/Denial on _____

Passed on

Draft Agenda
U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
STANDARDS BOARD MEETING
Hyatt Regency Coral Gables
Miami, Florida 33131
January 24-26, 2018
[subject to change and approval]

Wednesday, January 24, 2018

Coast Guard Visit *(TBD)*
Lunch stop *(TBD)*
Tour of Miami-Dade County Election Office *(TBD)*

Thursday, January 25, 2018

7:30-8:30 a.m.	**Registration** **Breakfast**
8:30-9:00 a.m.	**Welcome** **Video Welcome from Florida Member of Congress** **Call to Order** Edgardo Cortes, Chairman, EAC Standards Board **Pledge of Allegiance** Brad King, Vice-Chairman, EAC Standards Board **Roll Call; Determination of Quorum** Jerry Schwarting, Secretary, EAC Standards Board **Welcoming Remarks from the Commissioners** Matthew Masterson, Chairman, EAC Thomas Hicks, Vice-Chairman, EAC Christy McCormick, Commissioner, EAC, DFO
9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.	**Introductory Business** Approval of Minutes of April 27-28, 2017 Meeting Presentation of Certificates to New Members Packet Material Review: incl. committee interest Overview of VVSG, Bylaws, EAVS, EAC Clearinghouse, and USPS committees
9:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.	**FACA Responsibilities and role of Board under HAVA** Clifford D. Tatum, General Counsel, EAC

Friday, January 26, 2018, cont.

10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	**EAC's 2018 Campaign (and beyond) Preview** *Include security video, breakdown of programmatic highlights, monthly themes, audiences, purpose, etc.* Sean Greene, Director of Research, EAC Simona Jones, Webmaster & Social Media Specialist, David Kuennen, Senior Research Program Specialist, EAC Natalie Longwell, Public Affairs Specialist Brenda Bowser Soder, Director of Communications & Public Affairs, EAC
11:30 a.m. -11:45 a.m.	**Any remaining announcements or business** **Motion to Adjourn**

Michelle Blue

From: Brian Newby <BNewby@eac.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 26, 2017 1:48 PM
To: Angie.rogers@sos.louisiana.gov; apmiller@dcboe.org; astarling@tnaflcio.org; Anthony.Stevens@sos.nh.gov; auditor@co.jasper.ia.us; Aulii.c.tenn@hawaii.gov; bgoeckner@outlook.com; bking@iec.in.gov; bmatthews@elections.il.gov; bmosley@lafayettecoms.com; bpkemp@sos.ga.gov; bryan.caskey@sos.ks.gov; BuckhouseD@casscountynd.gov; BWestfall@wvsos.com; bwood@putnamwv.org; carol.morris@elections.ok.gov; carol.olson@sos.iowa.gov; carol.thompson@alaska.gov; chrissy.peters@sos.mo.gov; countyclerk@jeffersoncountyclerk.org; cpekron@qgtlaw.com; DCorson@mt.gov; debby.erickson@crowwing.us; derrin.robinson@co.harney.or.us; dkunko@co.chaves.nm.us; dorsetclerk@gmail.com; douglas.kellner@elections.ny.gov; dousan@oklahomacounty.org; dshively@lancaster.ne.gov; dwight.shellman@sos.state.co.us; edgardo.cortes@elections.virginia.gov; elaine.manlove@state.de.us; elections@cobma.us; elections@traviscountytx.gov; espencer@azsos.gov; fiti.tavai@gmail.com; gary.poser@state.mn.us; genevieve.whitaker@vi.gov; Griddlemoser@staffordcountyva.gov; HARSMANS@mcohio.org; Hawley.robertson@sos.ms.gov; howard.sholl@state.de.us; Howell@sos.mo.gov; jacksoncountyclerk@gmail.com; jerry.pettit@co.kittitas.wa.us; jgonzales@co.albany.wy.us; jmarks@pa.gov; joe.iseke@gec.guam.gov; John.Merrill@sos.Alabama.gov; josie.bahnke@alaska.gov; jpg@ClarkCountyNV.gov; JRoncelli@Bloomfieldtwp.org; jsilrum@nd.gov; julie.flynn@maine.gov; justinlee@utah.gov; jwendland@SOS.NV.gov; kai.schon@wyo.gov; Kari.Fresquez@state.nm.us; katie.brown@maryland.gov; kingram@sos.texas.gov; KLJ@portlandmaine.gov; Kristin.Gabriel@state.sd.us; lbailey@augustaga.gov; lealofi.uiagalelei@eo.as.gov; lgough@earthlink.net; lhmoor@hotamail.com; ljperret@lpclerk.com; LPhaneuf@Burrillville.org; lvonnessi@aol.com; marci@elections.sc.gov; Maria.Matthews@DOS.myflorida.com; maria.pangelinan@gec.guam.gov; Mark.Goins@tn.gov; maryellen.allen@ky.gov; Mellette@goldenwest.net; mgill@dcboe.org; Michael.Dickerson@mecklenburgcountync.gov; michael.haas@wi.gov; Michelle.Tassinari@sec.state.ma.us; Neal.kelley@rov.ocgov.com; nikki.charlson@maryland.gov; pattyweeks@co.nezperce.id.us; peggy.reeves@ct.gov; plux@co.okaloosa.fl.us; pwolfe@ohiosecretaryofstate.gov; rachel.bledi@albanycounty.com; rallende@cee.gobierno.pr; rmoore@cascadecountymt.gov; Robert.Giles@sos.nj.gov; robertd@pointing.com; rrock@sos.ri.gov; rsantos@co.weld.co.us; rvalenzuela@risc.maricopa.gov; sbrewer@co.butler.pa.us; Shirley.magarifuji@mauicounty.us; SLapsley@sos.ca.gov; Sherrie Swensen; Steve.trout@state.or.us; stevenreed@mc-ala.org; stuart.holmes@sos.wa.gov; tdecarlo@waterburyct.org; thurst@sos.idaho.gov; TR_county_clerk@wan.kdor.state.ks.us; trethlake@co.st-joseph.in.us; veronica.degraffenreid@ncsbe.gov; wanda.hemphill@yorkcountygov.com; WaValez@cee.gobierno.pr; will.senning@sec.state.vt.us; WilliamsS1@michigan.gov
Cc: Christy McCormick; Bryan Whitener
Subject: Upcoming State Election Meetings

Standards Board Member:

Michelle Blue

From: Brian Newby <BNewby@eac.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 1, 2018 10:56 AM
To: apmiller@dcboe.org; astarling@tnaflcio.org; Anthony.Stevens@sos.nh.gov; auditor@co.jasper.ia.us; Aulii.c.tenn@hawaii.gov; bgoeckner@outlook.com; bking@iec.in.gov; bmatthews@elections.il.gov; bmosley@lafayettecoms.com; bpkemp@sos.ga.gov; bryan.caskey@sos.ks.gov; BuckhouseD@casscountynd.gov; BWestfall@wvsos.com; bwood@putnamwv.org; carol.morris@elections.ok.gov; carol.olson@sos.iowa.gov; carol.thompson@alaska.gov; chrissy.peters@sos.mo.gov; countyclerk@jeffersoncountyclerk.org; cpekron@qgtlaw.com; DCorson@mt.gov; debby.erickson@crowwing.us; derrin.robinson@co.harney.or.us; dkunko@co.chaves.nm.us; dorsetclerk@gmail.com; douglas.kellner@elections.ny.gov; dousan@oklahomacounty.org; dshively@lancaster.ne.gov; dwight.shellman@sos.state.co.us; elaine.manlove@state.de.us; elections@cobma.us; elections@traviscountytx.gov; espencer@azsos.gov; fiti.tavai@gmail.com; gary.poser@state.mn.us; genevieve.whitaker@vi.gov; Griddlemoser@staffordcountyva.gov; HARSMANS@mcohio.org; Hawley.robertson@sos.ms.gov; howard.sholl@state.de.us; Howell@sos.mo.gov; jacksoncountyclerk@gmail.com; jerry.pettit@co.kittitas.wa.us; jgonzales@co.albany.wy.us; jmarks@pa.gov; joe.iseke@gec.guam.gov; John.Merrill@sos.Alabama.gov; josie.bahnke@alaska.gov; jpg@ClarkCountyNV.gov; JRoncelli@Bloomfieldtwp.org; jsilrum@nd.gov; julie.flynn@maine.gov; justinlee@utah.gov; jwendland@SOS.NV.gov; kai.schon@wyo.gov; Kari.Fresquez@state.nm.us; katie.brown@maryland.gov; kingram@sos.texas.gov; KLJ@portlandmaine.gov; Kristin.Gabriel@state.sd.us; lbailey@augustaga.gov; lealofi.uiagalelei@eo.as.gov; lgough@earthlink.net; lhmoor@hotamail.com; ljperret@lpclerk.com; LPhaneuf@Burrillville.org; lvonnessi@aol.com; marci@elections.sc.gov; Maria.Matthews@DOS.myflorida.com; maria.pangelinan@gec.guam.gov; Mark.Goins@tn.gov; maryellen.allen@ky.gov; Mellette@goldenwest.net; mgill@dcboe.org; Michael.Dickerson@mecklenburgcountync.gov; michael.haas@wi.gov; Michelle.Tassinari@sec.state.ma.us; Neal.kelley@rov.ocgov.com; nikki.charlson@maryland.gov; pattyweeks@co.nezperce.id.us; peggy.reeves@ct.gov; plux@co.okaloosa.fl.us; pwolfe@ohiosecretaryofstate.gov; rachel.bledi@albanycounty.com; rallende@cee.gobierno.pr; rmoore@cascadecountymt.gov; Robert.Giles@sos.nj.gov; robertd@pointing.com; rrock@sos.ri.gov; rsantos@co.weld.co.us; rvalenzuela@risc.maricopa.gov; sbrewer@co.butler.pa.us; Shirley.magarifuji@mauicounty.us; SLapsley@sos.ca.gov; Sherrie Swensen; Steve.trout@state.or.us; stevenreed@mc-ala.org; stuart.holmes@sos.wa.gov; tdecarlo@waterburyct.org; thurst@sos.idaho.gov; TR_county_clerk@wan.kdor.state.ks.us; trethlake@co.st-joseph.in.us; veronica.degraffenreid@ncsbe.gov; wanda.hemphill@yorkcountygov.com; WaValez@cee.gobierno.pr; will.senning@sec.state.vt.us; WilliamsS1@michigan.gov
Cc: Christy McCormick; Brian Hancock; Cliff Tatum
Subject: Voluntary Voting System Guidelines 2.0 Update

This email is being sent on behalf of Brad King, Chair of the EAC Standards Board.

US Election Assistance Commission
202-734-0639

Michelle Blue

From: Brian Raymond <braymond@daggettcounty.org>
Sent: Friday, January 8, 2021 7:43 AM
To: Justin Lee
Cc: VSUsersGroup Voting-Systems-Users-Group
Subject: Re: Election Material Printers

Daggett County has used SeaChange, but we are considering a change for 2022, so would be very interested in seeing the compiled list!
Thanks!
Brian

On Thu, Jan 7, 2021 at 2:38 PM Justin Lee <justinlee@utah.gov> wrote:

> Good Afternoon,
>
> Can each county please share which printers you use to print ballots and envelopes? If you can send that to me I can compile a list. If you would also like to share whether or not you plan to continue using them or not, and any other useful information I can share that list with all counties.
>
> Thanks,
>
> ---
> Justin Lee
> Director of Elections
> Office of the Lieutenant Governor
> State of Utah
> justinlee@utah.gov
>
> --
> You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "vsug@utah.gov" group.
> To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to vsug+unsubscribe@utah.gov.
> To view this discussion on the web visit
> https://groups.google.com/a/utah.gov/d/msgid/vsug/CAM_AU5xkLp4FqmyHRG8CV9DojGJzB%2BbMFLdDVbzeVpbq0c6jkA%40mail.gmail.com.

--

Brian Raymond

Daggett County Clerk
435-784-3154 Office
www.daggettcounty.org

www.visitflaminggorge.com

Michelle Blue

From: Brian Raymond <braymond@daggettcounty.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 4:01 PM
To: Marla Young
Cc: Hatch,Ricky; ckoch@co.davis.ut.us; Cowley,Ryan; alainal@juabcounty.com; bacrowther@sevier.utah.gov; bmckenzie@co.davis.ut.us; bpeart@richcountyut.org; BrendaT@emery.utah.gov; bryan@uacnet.org; camille.moore@garfield.utah.gov; clerkkj@kane.utah.gov; cyingling@utah.gov; datapro@manti.com; dianna.schaeffer@cachecounty.org; djessen@ironcounty.net; Intern,Elections; gingermcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; jdnielson@sanjuancounty.org; jevans@duchesne.utah.gov; JGranger@wasatch.utah.gov; jjhansen@utah.gov; justin.anderson@cachecounty.org; justinlee@utah.gov; jwhittaker@ironcounty.net; kgleave@piute.utah.gov; kim.hafen@washco.utah.gov; krobinson@summitcounty.org; Lannie Chapman; lori.perez@carbon.utah.gov; lshafer@utah.gov; markm@utah.gov; mcrook@wasatch.utah.gov; melanie.abplanalp@washco.utah.gov; mgillette@tooeleco.org; mhoward@summitcounty.org; mjackson@co.davis.ut.us; mrowley@co.millard.ut.us; mwilkins@uintah.utah.gov; rjudd@summitcounty.org; rwheeler@utah.gov; ryan@wayne.utah.gov; scwall@sevier.utah.gov; seth.marsing@carbon.utah.gov; slafitte@morgan-county.net; slyon@sanpetecountyutah.gov; Stephen Moore; sneill@sanpetecountyutah.gov; Sherrie Swensen; Scott Tingley; Stuart Tsai; swilkerson@morgan-county.net; tduncan@uintah.utah.gov; tlake@morgan-county.net; tmcmullin@beaver.utah.gov; wmcknight@wasatch.utah.gov; zeke@uacnet.org; Lindsey Parkinson; qhall@grandcountyutah.net; Shaneal Bess
Subject: Re: Need estimated savings amount for SB201

Daggett County does not have a newspaper of general circulation and therefore does not publish in the newspaper. There would be no cost savings for us.
Thanks!
Brian

On Thu, Feb 18, 2021 at 3:53 PM Marla Young <myoung@boxeldercounty.org> wrote:

Box Elder would be an average of $9,000.

On Thu, Feb 18, 2021 at 3:17 PM Hatch,Ricky <rhatch@co.weber.ut.us> wrote:

> For a fiscal note for SB201, we need to estimate how much money we would save by not needing to publish any notices in the local paper.
>
> One way to do this is to see how much, on average) you paid your newspaper vendor(s) over the past 3 or so years. Not perfect, but probably good enough for an estimate.
>
> As a reference, Weber Co. pays our newspaper approximately $30K per year, on average.

Michelle Blue

From: Bruce Baird <bbaird@difficultdirt.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2020 9:20 AM
To: Lincoln Shurtz; Sherrie Swensen; Lannie Chapman; Pam Tueller; Michael H Jensen; Gavin Anderson
Cc: Justin Lee
Subject: RE: Follow up on Referendum Issues and COVID

All:

May I respectfully note that Olympia Hills will object to the validity of any signatures that are not obtained and submitted to the Clerk in full compliance with applicable law, the Governor's Order and the Memorandum from Elections. And that would include the issues mentioned by Mr. Shurtz below.

Also, can someone please tell me when and how I can access any petitions "packets"/signatures that have been or may, from time-to-time be submitted? Some of those "packets"/signatures should have been returned by now.

Thanks and stay safe.

Brb

Bruce R. Baird
BRUCE R. BAIRD, PLLC
2150 South 1300 East, Suite 500
Salt Lake City, UT 84106
801.647.1400

From: Lincoln Shurtz <lincoln@uacnet.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2020 9:13 AM
To: Sherrie Swensen <sswensen@slco.org>; Lannie Chapman <LKChapman@slco.org>; Pam Tueller <PTueller@slco.org>; Michael H Jensen <mhjensen@slco.org>
Cc: Justin Lee <justinlee@utah.gov>
Subject: Re: Follow up on Referendum Issues and COVID

Hi Sherrie:

I just wanted to follow back up. I am a bit worried that the signature gatherers for Olympia Hills are not accurately representing the new Exec. Order. My fear is that we are going to upset the petitioners if the developer asks for those signatures that have been gathered incorrectly to be thrown out, and thus require folks to resign in accordance with the order. Due to the timeliness of the issue, I wanted to make sure there was clarity for everyone in the process.

Based on the petitioners information packet here are a few areas where there is still some misunderstanding.

- The ordinance needs to be returned with the signature page in order to complete the "packet" -- that is currently not being done, based on the correspondence/social media posts that are going out

Let me know if we can chat this afternoon to make sure we get direction out sooner than later to make sure everyone is treated fairly and equally.

Thanks so much!!

--
Sincerely,
Lincoln Shurtz, Director of Government Affairs
Utah Association of Counties
801-712-4891