



HB2790 & SB1026 NEAV

No Excuse Absentee Voting (NEAV)

Support SB1026 and HB2790

They provide for Seven (7) days of No Excuse Absentee Inperson Voting

These bills are the first step for complete No Excuse Absentee Voting.

Excuses will still be needed until the second Saturday before the November election day.

Why is NEAV valuable?

Personal privacy would no longer be compromised because you would not have to state and, in some cases, support your "excuse":

Name of your employer

Name of your business.

You are disabled...

You care for a family member and what your relationship is.

Where you will be on election day.

The jurisdiction where you have a protective order.

That you are pregnant.

That you are confined for a misdemeanor, and where.

The absentee application form itself is intimidating – see the large red asterisk:

*** Your application will be denied if a qualifying reason and required information are not provided.”**

Election Officers read everything on this form to check that all is complete. Often, a one-on-one explanation of the form is needed.

Thus, Privacy IS an issue.

With NEAV fewer election personnel would be needed because a Voter could check in without having his “excuse” information inspected.



HB2204:

This bill will protect the privacy of a Voter when checking in to Vote.

1. The Election Officer will not be required to audibly repeat the address of the voter who is offering to vote.
2. Currently, Voters do **not** have to provide their name and address audibly when they check in. They can choose to write their name and address for the Election Officer.
3. Currently, however, the Election Officer is required to state audibly both the name and address of the Voter.
4. Voters are concerned that certain bystanders could hear the address and use it for negative purposes such as stalking or infringement to their privacy.
5. This change is very simple. The Election Officer will continue to repeat the voter's name audibly but can use a written method to verify the address.
6. Thus, the requirement for verification of a match of name and address in the electronic pollbook is still completed.



SB1156 & HB2270:

from the ACLU:

SB 1156 Sanctuary policies; policies prohibited that restrict enforcement of federal immigration laws Patron: Senator Dick Black Status: Passed Senate 21-Y 19-N; Referred to House Committee on Counties, Cities and Towns. The ACLU of Virginia opposes SB 1156 and believes it is an unnecessary bill that will make our streets less safe. A combination of the Dillon Rule and existing state mandates make the existence of a sanctuary locality a legal impossibility in the Commonwealth. The language in this bill is also overbroad and vague and it cannot stand up to a constitutional challenge.

HB 2270 Incarcerated aliens, certain; release from jail, notice to Immigration & Customs Enforcement Patron: Delegate Charles Poindexter Status: Passed House 51-Y 46-N The ACLU of Virginia opposes HB 2270, among other similar bills, because it is unnecessary. Virginia law already requires notice to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) when a person is arrested and taken into custody, when a person is convicted, and when a person is released on probation or parole. Virginia law also permits release of a person into federal ICE custody up to five days before their release date on state or local charges. Mandating that sheriffs also notify ICE as soon as a release date is known creates yet another reporting mandate that is further complicated by the fact that some people in local and regional jails are in the custody of the state, not the sheriff or regional jail superintendent. Finally, Virginia should be moving away from volunteering local resources to the federal government for immigration enforcement instead of imposing new and unnecessary reporting requirements on local officials.



HB2269 & HB2611

HB 2269 Regional transportation sector emissions programs; participation by Commonwealth.

HB 2611 Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative; prohibition on participation by Commonwealth.

from League of Conservation Voters:

1. Delegate Poindexter's House Bill 2269 and House Bill 2611 would block our current efforts to combat climate change by preventing Virginia from joining the Transportation and Climate Initiative and the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, respectively.
2. These multi-state efforts are aimed at cutting carbon emissions from the transportation and electricity sectors - the two largest contributors to warming greenhouse gases in our atmosphere.
3. In Virginia, these two sectors comprise nearly 80 percent of our total carbon dioxide output, meaning urgent action is required now to begin addressing this major source of air pollution.
4. Climate impacts are already being felt across the state. If we don't act now, public health and safety, and our economy, will be further in harm's way.



SB1038

SB 1038 Voter registration; verification of social security numbers, provisional registration status. Oppose SB 1038

Regarding “provisional voter” status while waiting for verification of Social Security Number.

This is an additional, unnecessary burden for maintenance of Voter Rolls.

1. It would require that before any applicant is registered to vote, the applicant’s name, date of birth, and social security number provided on the voter registration application must match the information of file with the Social Security Administration or other database approved by the State Board of Elections.
2. The applicant would be a provisional voter and could only vote provisionally. After voting a provisional ballot the person would be required to show a photo ID at the Election Office by the Friday after election day. The photo ID options are much narrower than those allowed for Photo ID to vote under our existing Virginia law.
3. This means an extra process, burden, and delay for voters as well as for election offices and personnel.
4. Even perfect applications from a person can fail the matching process. The SSA database is known to have data errors and limitations within its matching software, system glitches, and other problems that applicants have no ability to correct. Thus, eligible, legitimate applicants could be erroneously rejected and then be unfairly “provisionally registered”.
[Even the SSA Office of the Inspector General reported in 2009 that their verification system had flaws and errors and was preventing eligible applicants from registering to vote.]
5. Virginians’ voting rights should not be hindered by such inaccuracies – including those that the Commonwealth cannot control or fix.
6. This process is not required by federal law.
7. Expensive changes to the current VERIS software would be needed. The FIS shows a total of \$780,000 needed to make the changes.
8. A very unfair burden, because of certain matching errors, could affect certain citizens more adversely than others. There may be more problems with names with special characters, hyphens, and first/last names that may be transposed by unfamiliar data entry workers.

9. The bill also requires registrars to regularly apply these matching requirements to **existing** registered voters, and if they do not match, start the cancellation process per state law.
10. Thus, the confusion, the possible errors, the burdensome process, highly likely delays close to election day and numerous provisional ballots show that SB1038 should not pass.

Cost estimate: <https://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?191+oth+SB1038F122+PDF>



SB1365

SB 1365 Education Improvement Scholarships tax credits; benefits and eligibility requirements.

Please oppose expanding the Tuition Tax Credit Programs: EISTC
“Education Improvement Scholarship Tax Credit Program”

1. Tuition Tax Credits reduce revenue for public schools.
Donors get a 65% tax credit, a Virginia Charitable donation credit and a Federal Charitable donation credit.
2. Up to \$25 million can go to private schools each year.
3. Millions of dollars should not be diverted from Virginia’s public schools.
4. Public schools are already underfunded.
5. Private school curriculum may include religious bias and religious training.
6. Private school policy may include gender discrimination. Title IX compliance is not required.
7. Transferring a student to a private school does not reduce a local school’s operating expenses.
8. VDOE has to employ personnel to administer the program; thus, funds diverted from classrooms.
9. Better education at these private schools has not been shown.
10. Donors benefit by taking both Federal and State charitable tax deductions
11. But the donation may not fully cover the student’s tuition.
12. Wealthy donors benefit more than the students do.
13. Parents are not always advised of the loss of protection of federal rights for disabled students.
14. Desirable diversity in the public school may be decreased.
15. Tax shelters undermine our public education.
16. There should be different mechanisms to support these special private schools.

For more information contact Carol Noggle at cnogg@comcast.net 571-437-8343



SB1502

SB 1502 Public schools; electives on the Hebrew Scriptures/Old Testament and the New Testament.

SB 1502 requires Virginia public high schools to offer an elective course on the Bible as literature. It also requires the state Board of Education to develop Standards of Learning for this course work, which the Board does not do for elective courses.

1. § 22.1-202.1. Comparative religion as elective course is already authorized by state law. SB 1502 differs from it a)in singling out the Christian Bible as the only course content, b)in mandating that each district offer the course, and c)in requiring the state Board of Education to develop Standards of Learning for an elective course.
2. SB 1502 is an unfunded mandate on local school districts, requiring them to divert money to pay a teacher's salary and provide curriculum materials for this class, regardless of how few students enroll.
3. \$20,000 is budgeted to pay for the state Board of Education to develop Standards of Learning for the course. Both this and the local school district expenses come from taxpayers, some of whom have other scriptures or none. Article I, Section 16 of the Virginia Constitution concludes, "it shall be left free to every person to select his religious instructor, and to make for his support such private contract as he shall please."
4. Virginia is proud to claim its Act for Religious Freedom, authored by Thomas Jefferson, and passed on January 16, 1786, three years before the US Constitution was adopted. § 57-1 is still the law of Virginia and is reflected in the Virginia Constitution.

<https://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?ses=191&typ=bil&val=sb1502>

<https://law.lis.virginia.gov/constitution/article1/section16/>

<https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title22.1/chapter13/section22.1-202.1/>

<https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title57/chapter1/section57-1/>