

Undocumented Motorist Safety & Insurance Task Force

Monday December 1, 2014

2:00 p.m.-4:00 p.m.

Buena Vista

Meeting Attendance

Task Force Members:

Present:

Senator Bryan Townsend	Bryan.Townsend@state.de.us	302-744-4165
Senator Brian Pettyjohn	Brian.Pettyjohn@state.de.us	302-744-4048
Representative Helene Keeley	Helene.Keeley@state.de.us	302-744-4351
Representative Joseph Miro	Joseph.Miro@state.de.us	302-744-4171
Deborah Gottschalk, Esq.	Deborah.Gottschalk@state.de.us	302-255-9038
Matthew Heckles	Matthew@destatehousing.com	302-739-4263
Javier Torrijos	DHC_Chair@state.de.us	302-894-6329
Rosario Calvachi-Mateyko	Charitocw@aol.com	717-951-0905
Major Melissa Zebley	Melissa.Zebley@state.de.us	302-270-8745
Ana Velasquez	avelasquez@thelatincenter.org	302-655-7338x7696
Jose Somalo	jose.somalo@gmail.com	302-854-0240
Bryan Cochran	bryan.cochran.idcb@statefarm.com	302-529-0556
Darlene Battle	dbattle@delaca.org	302-656-8200
Director Jennifer Cohan	Jennifer.Cohan@state.de.us	302-744-2545
Sean Lugg	Sean.Lugg@state.de.us	302-577-8809
Drew Fennell	Drew.Fennell@state.de.us	
Raymond Holcomb	Raymond.Holcomb@state.de.us	302-744-2678

Absent:

Senator Robert Marshall	Robert.Marshall@state.de.us	302-744-4168
Representative Andria Bennett	Andria.Bennett@state.de.us	302-744-4351
Chief William Topping	William.Topping@cj.state.de.us	302-856-6613
Karen Weldin Stewart	Karen.Stewart@state.de.us	302-674-7300
Pastor Jeremias Rojas	cryingprophet@verizon.net	302-562-4597
Claudia Peña Porretti	cporretti@laesperanza.org	302-854-9262x16
Keyla Rivero-Rodriguez	Keyla.Rivero-Rodriguez@state.de.us	302-857-5873
Judy Diogo	jdiogo@cdcc.net	302-734-7513
New Castle County Chamber of Commerce	-N/A	
Greater Georgetown Chamber of Commerce	-N/A	
Delmarva Poultry Industry	-N/A	

Staff:

Michelle Zdeb	Michelle.Zdeb@state.de.us	302-744-4059
Shelley Earley	Shelley.Earley@state.de.us	302-744-4188
Mariclaire Luciano	Mariclaire.Luciano@state.de.us	302-744-4180

<u>Attendees:</u>	<u>Organization:</u>	<u>Phone:</u>
Rhonda West	DOI	302-674-7379
Scott Vien	DMV	302-744-2730
Kami Beers	DMV	302-744-2561
Virginia Esteban	Hoy En Delaware	302-381-3327
Nancy Lemus	Public	302-252-6402
Andres Ramirez	DACA	302-981-5696
Damian DeStefano	House of Representatives	302-744-4030

INTRODUCTIONS

Senator Bryan Townsend, co-chair, brought the meeting to order at 2:15p.m. The Senator thanked members of the Task Force and the public for attending the meeting. He then introduced Senator Brian Pettyjohn, Representative Joseph Miro, Mariclaire Luciano (Legislative Assistant for Senator Robert Marshall), and Damian DeStefano (Legislative Aide for Representative Andria Bennett).

CONSIDERATION OF Task Force MEETING MINUTES

Senator Townsend asked the Task Force members to look at the Agenda to consider the Meeting Minutes dated October 1, 2014. The Senator stated that the proposed Minutes had been previously circulated and were also in front of them now. He then asked if any Task Force members would like to propose changes. Seeing none, the Senator asked for a motion to approve the Meeting Minutes.

Javier Torrijos, representing the Delaware Hispanic Commission, motioned to approve the Meeting Minutes.

Bryan Cochran, representing the private insurance industry, seconded the motion.

The Meeting Minutes from October 1, 2014, were approved by a unanimous vote.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT

Senator Townsend said that he would be happy to open the floor up to anyone who would like to share their thoughts. He also hoped that the Task Force would discuss the impact of President Obama's Executive Order on their work as a Task Force and the contents and dynamics of the Draft Report and whatever legislation would be recommended.

Mr. Cochran thanked everyone for the Task Force process. He said that he thought it was a very fair process that allowed everyone to have input. He further thanked Senator Townsend for asking him to serve. He stated that he had received the Senator's email and reviewed the proposed legislation and recommendations and findings. Mr. Cochran stated that there are over 300-400 insurance companies in Delaware and he had only been able to get input from a few of them. Therefore, he stated that as of today he could not vote on the Task Force's recommendations. He said he would attest to the findings and that those findings do speak to

what the committee has uncovered. Mr. Cochran also said he hopes that Senator Townsend will allow the insurance industry in the next week or so to continue to give him some input on legislation if that is the case.

Senator Townsend responded that he thought Mr. Cochran would not be the only person in the room who feels that they could not offer a formal vote today. In fact, the Senator said he was not sure that the Task Force would come to a formal vote. He said that the Task Force must face this reality, particularly given the Executive Order and whether that will change anyone's views of what the Task Force had discussed previously. He thanked Mr. Cochran for clarifying his point right from the beginning. Senator Townsend stated that in reviewing all the Meeting Minutes from previous meetings and putting together the Draft Report, he noted that the Task Force had spent a significant amount of time on insurance issues. He further stated this goes to the sincerity of what the Task Force is trying to address—Public Safety, which includes people having automobile insurance on the roadways. The Task Force's actual recommendations relating to insurance are pretty limited. The Senator then asked for any other comments.

Mr. Torrijos said in the past meeting the term Secure Communities had come up, and the issue of whether or not Delaware participates in the federal Secure Communities program. He asked for clarification.

Senator Townsend noted he had looked into it and that his understanding was that Delaware does participate in Secure Communities, but that whether Delaware does participate does not ultimately control what happens with fingerprints. Therefore he said he cannot speak specifically to that issue. The Senator said these kinds of issues might guide the specificity or conclusions by the end of the day if there are still outstanding questions that will determine various avenues the Task Force can take. Senator Townsend further addressed Mr. Torrijos' point specifically. When he looked into Secure Communities, it seemed to him Delaware participates, but he is unclear on how well it is enforced. He stated the discussion at the last meeting seemed driven largely from voices in Sussex County and that a lot of the concerns were from stories people were hearing from across the border in Maryland. Those stories did not seem to be specific, concrete information about what is happening in Delaware. Therefore the Senator said he does not have a definitive answer and is not sure the Task Force can get one. However, he would be happy to push for a definitive answer from outside of the Task Force to inform the General Assembly moving forward.

Ana Velasquez, representing the Latin American Community Center (LACC), stated that she was trying to verify whether Secure Communities is affected by the Executive Order and that the government is trying to get rid of it.

Senator Townsend agreed that it sounded like it is part of the Executive Order to suspend the program.

Mr. Torrijos thought it was not so much what Secure Communities does, but the perception the community has and how law enforcement is using that information and what the penalty can mean.

Senator Townsend encouraged other Task Force members to also raise their hand to share their thoughts. The Senator went on to say that his recollection from the last meeting in terms of perception applied not just to Secure Communities but to so much of what the Task Force is trying to address, the issues of fingerprinting specifically. However, Secure Communities was a very specific program that has played out differently in different locations, as opposed to the more theoretical concerns regarding fingerprinting and what the difference is between giving your photograph at the DMV versus giving your fingerprints and how that would impact someone's life. The Senator discussed that Secure Communities may be waived or unraveled by the President's Executive Order and also what impact there might be when a different president of the United States is elected in 2016 starting January 2017. Therefore the Senator said he did not think the Task Force should spin off into a different theoretical. He asked if anyone on the Task Force was an expert on the President's Executive Order. No one responded. The Senator said that he did receive some feedback from a Task Force member who wondered if the Draft Legislation should be structured the way it was submitted to Task Force members for consideration. He asked if Director Cohan from the DMV had a response.

Director Cohan, representing the Delaware Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV), said the reason DMV drafted the legislation the way they did is so that they do not have to go back to every other section in Title 21 and add Driving Privilege Card into those sections. Such a piece of legislation would be extremely long.

Deborah Gottschalk, Delaware Health & Social Services (DHSS), said her only concern was the way the draft statute was organized. The draft legislation said that everyone who applies has to provide proof of legal status in the United States. She thinks the paragraph needs to be restructured so that it is clear that if someone is applying for this card, they would not have to present that proof and that there are different items they could present.

Senator Townsend asked for clarification as to what line Ms. Gottschalk had concerns about.

Ms. Gottschalk responded that it was line 13, so that the Driving Privilege Card does not fall under the requirement of the Driver's License.

Senator Townsend said that the way the bill is structured is that it falls under the requirement of the Driver's License except for legal presence. He noted that "except for legal presence" is in line 15 but the Senator said he realizes that Ms. Gottschalk was suggesting to add "legal presence" in line 13 in order to differentiate it below. The Senator said that he was going to wait until a later date in regards to the specificity of the way it is written, although he agreed that it is a very important point. He also noted that it is helpful to know from the point of view of the

DMV that if it was differentiated more broadly it would require revisions to all sorts of different sections of the Code.

Ms. Gottschalk agreed that Senator Townsend's point made perfect sense. She gave an example of when a family comes in and applies for Medicaid for just their children. Medicaid requires the proof of legal status in the United States. Her point was that if the bill says everyone who is applying needs proof, it could be a barrier. It should be made clear that there is a way to apply without asking for citizenship.

Senator Townsend asked if there were any additional comments. He said that he is aware that the Task Force has the issue of fingerprinting to discuss and what ways the President's Executive Order may change the requirements of the Privilege Card application or the community based education campaigns or any other dynamic that the Task Force has been discussing.

Jose Somalo, representing the Mid-Atlantic Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, asked if the Task Force was requiring just Delaware tax returns or also Federal tax returns.

Director Cohan responded that it would be just Delaware tax returns. She noted other states are doing various things.

Senator Townsend commented that he thinks that the idea of Delaware tax returns only gets to the issue of residency, which brings up the very fair point of what is said to someone who is moving to Delaware who has a firm job offer and needs to start driving immediately for that job offer. Under the proposed statute, this person would have to wait two years to be able to apply for this card. The Senator said he is very open to being part of a conversation at the General Assembly level to see if there is some other way to avoid that problem. The Senator also noted the problem the DMV would have to verify employment offers and he wondered how that would fit into this system. He asked if Director Cohan had any thoughts about this as far as from the DMV's perspective.

Director Cohan said that was the first she had heard of that and could not respond at this time.

Senator Townsend commented that it was very briefly brought up at one of the previous meetings but not at any length at all as far as who is not eligible under the draft legislation.

Representative Miro said that he thinks there needs to be an alternative, such as a letter or other type of document, that would indicate that the individual is going to reside in Delaware and has a need to be able to drive.

Senator Townsend said the Task Force has been trying to strike a balance between the Driving Card becoming an avenue for lawful driving while not somehow encouraging an influx of new residents to Delaware in mass numbers and certainly the fraudulent issues. Other states have seen applications for these driving cards spike, and many have seemed to be based on fraud. The Senator said that one question is should there be some sort of employment letter and, if so, would

it only be available for some employers. It shows how the Task Force product is not going to be perfect and it is something to think about moving forward down in Dover. Senator Townsend announced that Representative Helene Keeley, co-chair, just joined the meeting.

Representative Helene Keeley apologized for arriving late due to heavy traffic.

Mr. Torrijos asked if an individual lived in the state of Maryland, would there be reciprocity if that person moved to Delaware and was able to provide documentation. Would that person be eligible to obtain a Driving Privilege Card in Delaware? He further asked for Senator Townsend's thoughts.

Senator Townsend replied it was an interesting idea.

Director Cohan replied that the DMV could enter into a separate agreement with Maryland. She said that the DMV would consider Maryland because their requirements are the same. She said that the DMV would be leery of that with other states because not all have the same level of requirements.

Senator Townsend said the idea of reciprocity with Maryland is based on the idea that their system is similar to Delaware. Consider a state that does not have a Driver's Privilege Card. If we were to accept tax returns from that state and an individual is moving here, that would be a very different situation than someone who has just arrived with no record whatsoever of being in the United States previously. If we know the tax return requirement is in part trying to establish a balance between offering this avenue and not doing so in a way that might encourage an influx of new immigrants, is it best trying to structure it so that if you have already resided somewhere else for two years and have been working for two years and have tax returns to prove it, that we would accept you into the system here in Delaware? The Senator said he thought it was an interesting way to try and approach that. He noted that it is obviously a very sensitive topic. The Senator asked what the Task Force members' thoughts are on the fingerprinting issue. He asked if there has been any evolution or change in people's thinking or communities' thinking in the past two months.

Mr. Torrijos replied that his preference would be if the bill could be passed without fingerprinting. He questioned if the Task Force could say that facial recognition offers just about the same accuracy as fingerprinting. He struggles with needing to add fingerprinting. The idea was to encourage people to sign up for the Driving Privilege Card so we can provide safe roads for all Delaware citizens. That is the goal. Mr. Torrijos thinks fingerprinting would be an obstacle. He noted that he understands the concerns of the State Police, but thinks facial recognition gives them what they need, even if it is not 100%. He wondered if the DMV could comment since they deal with this day in and day out.

Senator Townsend said he is happy to ask the DMV to comment on their position but noted that DMV could not speak for law enforcement's position.

Director Cohan stated Mr. Torrijos is correct. The biometric that DMV uses for facial recognition is very good. DMV stands on fingerprinting serving no purpose for them. The DMV has spoken to the vendor that supplies the driver's license system and they have learned that trying to implement fingerprinting into the front line process will be problematic if not near impossible. And if done, it would be very expensive. Director Cohan said speaking specifically for the DMV, fingerprinting is not going to do anything for them that they do not already have in place now. In fact it would price them out of feasibility.

Senator Townsend said that in order to focus on the real key issues in terms of fingerprinting, he would assume that the process would be similar to the process already in place for applicants to the bar or child care. This process involves going to the State Bureau of Identification, where you walk in and get your fingerprints put on record and you get a form that says your fingerprints have been taken. To the extent that the cost to DMV would be prohibitive, the Senator assumed SBI would take care of the process. With that said, we would be talking about undocumented citizens walking into a facility they might not want to go into.

Drew Fennell, representing the Governor's office, asked what other states do.

Senator Townsend said that some other state require fingerprinting and some do not. He asked Director Cohan how the state of Utah went about it.

Director Cohan responded that Utah has a temporary one-year Driving Privilege Card. They put forth a bill that did not have extra requirements. They did not require residency. There was a ton of fraud. Utah went back and amended the bill and added fingerprints.

Senator Townsend asked how they captured the fingerprints.

Director Cohan answered that outside agencies capture the fingerprints. She is not aware of any other states that require fingerprints.

Ms. Fennell asked for clarification that none of the other states do.

Mr. Somalo also asked if Utah is the only state doing this.

Director Cohan said yes and that Utah had to go back and amend what they did because Utah had so much fraud with the Driver's Privilege card initially because it was not as strict as what we are recommending. They had to find a way to match the Driver's Privilege Card with the individuals.

Mr. Somalo stated he does not see the fingerprinting as an obstacle. He is not representing anyone specific, but he has been working with the community for many years. For people who want to do the right thing and prove that they are who they say they are, fingerprinting is a positive thing. If it is cost prohibitive to have it at the DMV, there are other considerations. He emphasized that he does not see fingerprinting as a bad thing.

Major Melissa Zebley, representing the Delaware State Police, added that from the State Police's perspective, fingerprinting would remain with SBI as it always has. The State Police would not be looking to shift that burden to DMV. The State Police relies on DMV for facial recognition. She said that her thought was that given that SBI does fingerprinting for other reasons, that responsibility would remain with them.

Ms. Velasquez said that to put some extent with the Executive Order, the candidates that can apply are parents of U.S. children or permanent resident children, and would also have to go through a biometric or fingerprinting process in order to be eligible for the deferred action. She thinks the Task Force should put that into context with what is being discussed at this meeting.

Senator Townsend stated when Ms. Velasquez said "biometric or fingerprinting" the word "or" is key and this is what the Task Force is struggling with. Biometrics are one thing and fingerprinting is technically a subset or an example of biometrics. Between biometric or fingerprinting, it is pretty clear which one is a source of disagreement.

Senator Pettyjohn said that it is fingerprinting.

Senator Townsend asked the Task Force how they think the broader community would react to a requirement of fingerprints.

Mr. Somalo said that the concern he has heard from several people is that not having fingerprinting may open the door for people coming from other states. The fraud possibilities are real. He noted that it happened in Utah even though the standards were not as strict as what this Task Force is looking at right now. He repeated that he thinks it opens the door for people to come from other states and apply for the Driving Privilege Card.

Director Cohan said that is why they have the two-year tax requirement, to avoid something like that.

Mr. Somalo said in Maryland the DMV is in charge of checking those tax returns and he asked how it will be done in Delaware. Who will be in charge of checking them and making sure that those returns are real?

Director Cohan said that the DMV would have to work with the Delaware Division of Revenue. She commented that they do have a mechanism to do that.

Mr. Torrijos realizes that fingerprinting is the most ideal situation, but asked the members to go back to thinking about what the objective of the Task Force is. He said if fingerprinting is creating barriers, can the Task Force set aside that requirement, especially if there is a lot of confidence in facial recognition? Mr. Torrijos wants to encourage people to register for the Driving Privilege Card, and if the Task Force wants there to be success, then he suggests doing away with the fingerprinting barrier as long as other biometrics are in place and will work to keep Delawareans safe.

Senator Pettyjohn asked if the availability of an agency to have access to facial recognition is similar to the process of fingerprinting when someone is pulled over. He gave an example of when someone is pulled over by Georgetown Police Department; the police can pull the fingerprints fairly quickly. Can they do the same for facial recognition through SBI?

Officer Zebley answered the State Police relies on DMV for facial recognition.

Senator Townsend stated at the last meeting the Task Force spent a lot of time talking about this issue. Chief Topping had talked about the new tools or technology that certain police departments were preparing to acquire. This technology would allow the police to take fingerprints at roadside and verify. That is not possible with facial recognition interfacing with the DMV. Senator Townsend gave the example that Chief Topping had given regarding a situation at 3:00am on a dark, windy, rainy night and not being able to rely on facial recognition. However, there may be better and new technology that can do a better job. Senator Townsend addressed Mr. Torrijos and said that he thinks that not every member of this Task Force would agree on the exact charge of the Task Force. He noted this is something members will decide by the end of this meeting. The Senator went on to say in terms of what Chief Topping previously stated, the use of fingerprints on scene and to be able to verify someone's identity as opposed to facial recognition do not provide the same speed for verification. He asked DMV to respond as to whether officers could hook up to a database quickly using something like a smartphone photo of someone roadside.

Director Cohan answered DMV has a function via which law enforcement can access the photos.

Officer Zebley said the State Police have laptops in the vehicles that allow them to access images roadside. She said she could not speak for every agency in the state, but her understanding is that most do.

Senator Townsend clarified by saying that the police would look at someone roadside, go back to their car to look at the laptop and make a visual comparison as opposed to technology that would allow for biometric information to be filtered through whatever system would compare what they see roadside versus a picture that person would have had taken at the DMV. He asked Officer Zebley to verify whether that kind of technology exists right now.

Officer Zebley responded no, not to the level that the Senator described. They only would see the image that was taken at the DMV.

Senator Townsend said it goes to Mr. Torrijos' point as to what is the benefit or point of fingerprinting. It also goes back to earlier, and the DMV's perspective that facial recognition is sufficient for them to make sure that a person only walks in the DMV once and gets one card. That is different from what the police would like to have in the system for a variety of reasons.

Director Cohan added that police have access to all of the photos ever taken so they can see a succession of images.

Ms. Velasquez said that she remembered Chief Topping saying that it would only be very few that would have access to that technology for fingerprinting. She noted this means having fingerprints on file was not going to have a real impact.

Senator Townsend stated the database is not just out there for people to access. There would have to be a specific set of purposes to go into the fingerprint database at SBI in order to be able to access it. The Senator said that also goes back to his own confusion about the real-life impact that giving fingerprints would have on people as opposed to walking into the DMV and giving a photo. He separates that from the psychological aspect. The Senator again stated that Chief Topping made the point that the database would not be open for people to access inappropriately.

Ms. Velasquez said access concerns relate not only to the database but also to whatever technology that they would have on the side of the road.

Officer Zebley stated that part of the discussion about fingerprints was not just about the folks trying to get a Driving Privilege Card but for preventing fraud on the front end. A tangible concern is to mitigate fraud on the front end. The hope is that they do not fingerprint roadside but rather that they can have more confidence that the card stands for itself.

Senator Townsend referenced to Raymond Holcomb, representing the Department of Homeland Security, that it took the Task Force a while at the last meeting to get to the point where it was clear that the Major was saying if there is a roadside stop producing the Driving Privilege Card it would be the same as producing a driver's license. Unless the officer has reason to visually believe that the person in the car is not the person on the card, the police will take it as a lawfully legitimate card and not ask for fingerprints. The Senator further noted the Task Force had much discussion last time as to whether or not the fingerprinting would still be part of the process. It took the Task Force a while to get to the fact that in theory it would not. He then stated with that being said, fingerprints on the application step would be an initial form fraud mitigation. He highlighted the fact that the DMV said that they feel fully confident that their facial recognition software achieves that end. The Senator understands law enforcement's perspective in terms of the initial information and why it would be helpful. However, he does want to emphasize the fact that there are some competing statements about the adequacy of the facial recognition software.

Ray Holcomb, responded stating he understands that fingerprinting is not well received in the undocumented community and he can appreciate what the concern is. If, after two years as was the case in Utah, an adequate system was not being used to confirm who the person is actually is who they say they are, and we find out that fraud is rampant, then Mr. Holcomb thinks the whole thing could collapse on itself. He said there are two perceptions here. It needs to be a good

system that the populace has trust in and confidence in. He also understands that it needs to be a system that undocumented folks can come forward and feel confident that they are not going to be targeted by immigration officials. Mr. Holcomb noted that it is important that it is a reliable system and that people have confidence in the system.

Representative Miro asked for clarification as to when the individual is stopped on the road, if the fingerprint is on file, would every office from the State Police be equipped to take the fingerprint from that individual right there or would they have to take that individual back to the station.

Senator Townsend replied that in theory if the driver has a Driving Privilege Card, there would be no taking of any additional information. The police would look at the card just as they look at your license and know that you are driving lawfully.

Representative Miro asked what if the license would not have fingerprints on it.

Senator Townsend asked if he meant with fingerprints or without fingerprints as part of the application.

Representative Miro said in the situation where there has been a fingerprint taken. How can the officer on the road verify?

Major Zebley said the card verifies they are who they say they are.

Representative Miro clarified whether she meant the card without taking the fingerprint at the site or the station, and that in order to have issued the card the fingerprint had been taken and was presented somewhere.

Major Zebley said correct.

Senator Townsend asked Major Zebley to correct him if his following statement is incorrect. The card would verify who they say they are even if fingerprints are not part of the process. If we as the Task Force or General Assembly were to pass a bill that does not require fingerprints, in theory law enforcement would still not take fingerprints. The police would look at the card as being lawfully authorized, the driver is lawfully driving, and they may individually or officially view it as not as strong a system as it could be without the fingerprints, but they would not be saying thank you for letting me see your Driving Privilege Card but now let me take your fingerprints.

Representative Miro said that where he is going with all of this is someone may say that we are discriminating because we do not take the fingerprint from anybody else.

Senator Townsend said for licenses, he did not think so.

Representative Miro asked if we institute the process of the fingerprints and we do not fingerprint anybody else, are we discriminating.

Senator Townsend answered I am going to have to answer that question yes.

Mr. Torrijos said when he was on the radio that was something that he got hammered over. He tried to defend it.

Representative Miro responded that is why he posed the question. The fact of the matter is we do not fingerprint for anything else.

Senator Townsend clarified by saying “anyone else for driver’s licenses.” The Senator said he was reminded that he had to give his fingerprints to become a member of the Delaware Bar. Another example would be anyone involved with child care, and there are probably other examples where you have to give your fingerprints for various kinds of privileges or opportunities.

Representative Miro said but for driving, which is what we are focusing on here, no one is required to be fingerprinted.

Senator Townsend agreed.

Senator Brian Pettyjohn said that a birth certificate is required for a regular driver’s license, which would not be required here.

Representative Miro noted that we are going to require other documents.

Senator Townsend reiterated that DMV has stated they cannot verify documents from the country of origin. They are not in the business of verifying documents from out of the United States.

Representative Miro responded that on the other hand we are not requiring anyone else to bring tax returns. There are other documents that are being asked to be presented in order to confirm or verify the identity of the individual. Yes, you do not have the birth certificate but you are asking for two years of tax returns.

Senator Townsend understood. The Senator stated he is fascinated by the accuracy of facial recognition software and technology and whether or not that would be sufficient for many of our stated purposes that we are trying to get at here. He further noted as seen from other examples from other states, if there are not certain kinds of systems and checks in place, there will be a great deal of applications for these. However, he said the cards would state warnings that the card is not a formal form of identification. The Senator said that Representative Miro pointed out the issues that the Task Force has been struggling with.

Mr. Somalo said to obtain a driver's license a person has to submit a birth certificate. Fingerprinting for a Driving Privilege Card is different but it depends how people look at it.

Director Cohan said the DMV is very confident in the facial recognition software. One of the scenarios that has occurred, which is why they ask for two years tax returns, is that if someone comes into Delaware and they have all the information, DMV cannot use facial recognition to prove they are not someone else in another state. She said that could be an initial fraud possibility. The only thing DMV could do is say that you have not already applied for a card.

Mr. Torrijos asked if that is what we accept.

Director Cohan said that someone coming to the Delaware DMV from another state must go through the entire process to get a regular driver's license. They could not say they were not another person in another state. The fingerprinting, if they had ever been in the system, would catch that.

Mr. Torrijos said that the DMV at least would be able to tell that person only came through once. He asked if we know how Maryland is doing with their Driving Privilege Card program.

Director Cohan responded they are not getting as many applications as they thought they were going to get. However, it has been steady. There was a high failure rate of tests so they are now focusing on different ways to educate for the written test. She explained that in Delaware, the DMV does not allow anyone to go out on the road until they pass the written test.

Senator Townsend opened the floor for public comment.

Nancy Lemus, from the public, said that it took over 6 weeks to get state tax returns and over 6 months to get the federal. She asked how that process would work if they did have to get fingerprints. Would it still take the initial 6 to 8 weeks? For someone who has to get all of these things together, how long will that take? She had concerns regarding abuse of the Latino community, as far as some people having something that someone else does not have. An example is someone borrowing someone's car and then being told they have many red light tickets. Often these people become victims. How long will it really take to get a Driving Privilege Card?

Senator Townsend said to the point of SBI, he said he does not recall how long it took to get his fingerprint results. He remembers getting a form that said he had provided them.

Senator Pettyjohn said he did not think the Task Force is talking about getting a background check done. That takes more time. This is just about submitting your fingerprints. You get the form from SBI saying that the fingerprints were done.

Senator Townsend asked Nancy Lemus to clarify if she had been referring to a background check in her above comments.

Nancy Lemus said yes.

Senator Townsend explained this would be just fingerprints.

Nancy Lemus said that often when people in her community hear fingerprints, they think it is FBI and a background check.

Senator Townsend said that apparently President Obama's Executive Order also will trigger a background check. He said that he has heard a lot of praise for the Executive Order from the Hispanic community. If the Executive Order has been received well and is viewed as an important step forward and welcomed with open arms, and yet it involves criminal background checks, let us put that into context with what the Task Force is talking about here.

Senator Pettyjohn said the Task Force may be putting the cart before the horse. Usually when you go into the SBI to get your fingerprints done, you have to produce some type of identification. Yet here, the applicants will not yet have any type of photo identification. The Senator said that it may be something that will have to be dealt with legislatively.

Representative Miro said that for the last seven or eight months all we hear about is that the Latino community does not have the legal papers. We just finished an election and he spent a lot of time walking in his district. There were a significant number of undocumented people in his district who were not Latinos. There were many varied groups represented that would benefit from the legislation that are not Latino. He said that he believes that in New Castle County the numbers of non-Latino undocumented residents will be very substantial.

Senator Townsend reminded the Representative that Darlene Battle has previously spoken to that issue.

Representative Keeley noted the Task Force is at a fork in the road. More importantly, a plan needs to be in place after a decision is made. The legislation will allow it to happen, but it is very important to consider that the plan that has to be executed after the legislation. Non-profit agencies, the DMV, and the Task Force should be part of the larger plan. Proper education needs to be provided so that people can pass the written test, and proper communication provided so that people know that if fingerprinting is part of the process it does not include a background check. If a strong plan is in place, the decisions will be much easier to make.

Senator Townsend asked Task Force members who do not want fingerprints to be part of the process if the type of plan that Representative Keeley described would help overcome some of the roadblocks.

Ms. Gottschalk asked if portable fingerprinting machines in other locations might be something to consider, since many people are intimidated about walking into a police station. If people could walk into a more trusted environment they might be more willing to do so.

Major Zebley said the process currently is an automated machine, and it would not be easy to make the process portable.

Representative Keeley commented that her iPhone 6 has the technology to use her thumbprint to identify her, so there should be technology or a device that could accomplish this task.

Major Zebley explained that the intake machine has to populate the fingerprints into a secure system. There are special machines that must be used.

Representative Keeley asked what the cost would be for a machine that Major Zebley described.

Major Zebley said the cost of the machine is not the main issue but rather having the secure line.

Representative Keeley asked if it would be possible to find out what the cost of a mobile unit that could go to a state service center, for example, would be.

Senator Townsend said he was not sure that those location sites would be willing to host an intake event, but also wondered if the cost would be possible.

Major Zebley mentioned that specifically trained people provide the service.

Senator Townsend commented that it is a concrete example of the point that Representative Keeley made in the sense of what is the operational plan. Developing such a plan was discussed at the early meetings of the Task Force but never really addressed because of the other dynamics that were never sorted out or agreed upon. The Senator said he did not think the Task Force was at a point today to make a decision about this, but it is an example of steps that need to be considered.

Representative Keeley pointed out that one of the members of the Task Force is also a member of the Joint Finance Committee (JFC).

Senator Townsend welcomed Task Force member Rosario Calvachi-Mateyko who just arrived after dealing with a flat tire.

Rosario Calvachi-Mateyko, representing the Delaware Hispanic Commission, thanked the Senator.

Director Cohan said if the fingerprints are included, the DMV would want to check results with other states, and it would not be an instantaneous process.

Senator Townsend said that emphasizes the usefulness of the fingerprints on the front end but wondered how long the process Director Cohan described would take.

Ms. Velasquez responded six to eight weeks is the normal time period.

Representative Keeley asked Mr. Cochran if a person gets the fingerprints and there is no alias or criminal record, does that do anything for the insurance side of things.

Mr. Cochran said no, not for our company. The person would need a driver's license or some Privilege Card before they will insure anyone.

Representative Miro asked if there is an alias or something similar, what can that person do?

Senator Townsend asked if Representative Miro meant if that person's fingerprint hit on something.

Representative Miro gave an example of several different people with the same name showing up in various other states. What would that mean.

Senator Townsend said the issue would be if the fingerprint hit for a match for something that law enforcement somewhere is looking for. The Senator wondered what would happen procedurally at SBI. He also assumed that the applicant would not get whatever documentation would be set up for DMV to take the next steps such as a written test, road test, and eye test. The Senator asked what would happen from SBI's perspective if they hit on a match for something.

Mr. Holcomb said the fact there may be several other people with the same name would not be problematic, as long as your date-of-birth did not match. The problem would be if there was a serious criminal record. In that case, authorities would have to do something.

Representative Miro asked how a person would prove who they are versus another person with the same name.

Senator Pettyjohn said fingerprints.

Senator Townsend said a fingerprint match hitting on a serious crime is the more important thing to consider. Another conversation would be what level of crime has to be achieved. The Senator noted he would like the Task Force to discuss the idea of a Trust Act. The idea of a Trust Act would be what happens to some of this information. The Senator said as far as a fingerprint match, the issue would be far more serious if it involves a serious crime rather than just someone with the same name somewhere else.

Representative Miro asked if it would take months or years to resolve.

Mr. Holcomb responded that it might take months, not years, and that there could be a case where the fingerprints prove the person is not the one who committed a crime.

Senator Townsend said that Representative Miro's comments sound as though he thinks the person in question would have to prove who they are to the DMV or SBI to get the card. The card is going to have information printed on it that indicates it is not for identification. The point is that anyone can get the card as long as their fingerprints do not hit on a crime committed

somewhere else. The card does not mean that the person is who they say they are but rather that if stopped that person has been authorized to drive on roadways because the fingerprints are part of process, and that the person passed a written test, road test, and eye test in order to receive the card. The card is not about true identity.

Representative Miro stated that he is not in favor of the fingerprinting. Fingerprinting creates a significant obstacle for individuals. Many people will not do it if they have to walk into a police station to have it done and they have the perception that other things will happen if they do. Walking into a school causes the same kinds of intimidation for some people as well.

Senator Townsend said he fully agrees but wonders what the difference is between walking into the DMV and getting a photograph to get a card compared to having fingerprints also be part of the application process. In either case, they have to walk into DMV and get their picture taken.

Representative Miro replied that there is a difference.

Senator Townsend agreed that psychologically it is different but in terms of what the actual impact is on their lives, the Senator struggles to understand the difference. He hopes that this Task Force process can translate into something meaningful for a lot of people. He wonders what will happen if other people ask why fingerprints are not part of the process, especially when applicants would already be walking into the DMV. The Senator agreed that many people do not participate in a number of things in our community out of fear and discomfort. However, in this case the Task Force is talking about people who are already willing to walk in and get their picture taken at the DMV but might not be willing to do it if fingerprints are part of it. The Senator struggles with that idea, though he recognizes that the discussion has brought to light many of the issues with logistics of other aspects of the fingerprinting, such as how long it will take, what will the process involve, and how will the results be verified.

Representative Miro asked how many other regular residents of the state of Delaware would not get their driver's license if they had to get their fingerprints taken as part of the process.

Senator Townsend agreed. He said that he had discussed over the weekend these issues at length with his wife, who had immigrated to the U.S. at the age of five, to get her perspective in that regard. The fact is that the legal status of the population of individuals being discussed is different from another population of individuals. If you are a United States citizen or here lawfully you do not have to give your fingerprint to get a driver's license. The naturalization process does require fingerprints. If people have not gone through that process then the Task Force or General Assembly would be saying that those people might have to give their fingerprint. The Senator asked if that would be considered discrimination and if so would it be considered acceptable discrimination or bad discrimination.

Representative Miro said he wondered how many high school graduates who wait to get their licenses until later and then may have committed some crimes and have a record would not try to get their license.

Senator Townsend asked how many crimes would be solved if everyone did have to get fingerprinted. There are public safety benefits from fingerprinting everyone.

Senator Pettyjohn said that committing a misdemeanor does not prohibit anyone from getting a driver's license renewed.

Representative Miro replied that if it was an initial license and someone had their fingerprint on file because of a crime it could cause an issue.

Senator Pettyjohn replied that he did not think that anywhere in the discussion was the Task Force saying that someone would have to have a clean record in order to get a license.

Senator Townsend said he thought it was more the idea of someone in the situation described above would have to go through the process and whether they would still be willing to go through the process.

Senator Pettyjohn gave an example of Senator Townsend deciding to go into law and having to submit his fingerprints. Similarly, the Senator himself submitting his fingerprints to get his insurance license. In both instances, it was a choice. There are other examples where other people also have willingly submitted their fingerprints in order to achieve the goal that they want.

Representative Miro said the point is that not everyone is required to follow the process described.

Senator Pettyjohn replied that they are required to provide other forms of identification from other people.

Representative Miro agreed.

Senator Pettyjohn added that those other forms of identification are not required from the subset being discussed. Different types of information would be required.

Mr. Torrijos said the risk outweighs the benefits. If the benefit is to get as many people as possible to get the Driving Privilege Card, then the Task Force should take a hard look at requiring the fingerprints. Mr. Torrijos said he was also concerned with the fiscal note attached with the fingerprinting process. The Task Force should consider if requiring it might make it nearly impossible to get a bill passed. He did agree that requiring the fingerprinting would be best but the Task Force might want to consider waiting a year to attach that requirement. If the process is too stringent then there would be little participation.

Senator Townsend asked the team to consider if fingerprinting was not required and whether people would go through the process and would ultimately obtain insurance. Would the kind of people who are willing to take all the steps also be willing to get fingerprints? Or are there a large number of people who would not do this if fingerprints were required? Yet without fingerprints, they would go through all the steps, including getting insurance? The Senator gave an example of a young high school student he recently met who had difficulty with participating in after-school activities, due to having to drive his younger siblings around because his parents want to limit the number of times they drive—because they are not here legally.

Ms. Gottschalk said she thinks that the kind of people who present themselves to DMV without fingerprinting requirement will present themselves to the government office, go on record with where they live, present their tax returns, have their photograph taken, and get car insurance. They are probably not people that the police would be looking for in a fingerprinting check. If they are going to walk in the door, they are probably more responsible people.

Senator Townsend agreed and said that her comments describe his frustration.

Ms. Velasquez said she thinks the issue of fingerprinting can be overcome with education. The timeline of a six to eight weeks and the complexity of the process is more concerning to Ms. Velasquez.

Senator Townsend commented the number of people that would sign up also is a concern. He said that the President's Executive Order will be impacting the process in Delaware.

Representative Keeley is perplexed by Homeland Security and State Police's perspective of facial recognition versus the fingerprint. The technology available is very advanced today. She asked Mr. Holcomb if that was just not secure enough for Homeland Security.

Mr. Holcomb said that there is technology but there are all kinds of privacy issues involved. However he agreed that the technology is available.

Representative Keeley asked if Mr. Holcomb was referring to facial recognition.

Mr. Holcomb responded that the technology is there with fingerprints too.

Representative Keeley asked with the technology involving facial recognition, what is the difference between the facial recognition and the fingerprint?

Major Zebley said that anyone will be who they say they are the day they walk into the DMV. That is the concern of the police. The database of history is not there. Major Zebley said the police feel more secure with having the fingerprints on the front end.

Representative Keeley asked if the information is available from other states of the percentage of people who would not get fingerprinted. Or is information also available regarding the

percentage of people who did go and get fingerprinted and then were found to have committed a crime in another state.

Director Cohan said she did not have numbers. In Utah it is not a big issue.

Rhonda West, representing the Insurance Commissioner, referred back to the issues of technology and Chief Topping's previous comments about technology being available with some portable machines.

Senator Townsend wondered if anyone in Delaware might be asked to put their fingerprints on a scanner and what the privacy implications of that are. Chief Topping talked about having the technology, but have there been privacy discussions associated with that? The Senator said that topic may be discussed in a different context later. The Senator brought up the topic of the Trust Act and asked if it makes any difference or not for what the Task Force has been discussing. The Senator reminded the members that the Trust Act might be a legislative document that does the best to pledge that the information captured in the application process would not be shared with Federal officials or immigration officials outside the context of criminal activity. If fingerprints would hit on a serious crime somewhere else, that would be pursued. People applying for a Driving Privilege Card would take some comfort from the Delaware General Assembly having pledged or instructed state agencies not to share the information with Federal or immigration officials generally. The Senator asked the member of the Task Force if they thought that kind of Trust Act would do anything in the context being discussed today.

Mr. Torrijos said that he thought that when previously discussed the Task Force thought it was a good idea. It would be something that the communities would know that the state is willing to sign on to and ensure that the information would not be generally shared with the federal government. Mr. Torrijos said he thinks that is a step in the right direction, gives some type of credibility that the information given at the DMV will not be shared with others, and is a good compromise. It does not take away the fact that the Federal government can come in at any time and ask for information, and Mr. Torrijos thinks that is part of the problem. He emphasized that the communities will need to know the fact that the Federal government might be able to access information if they want to.

Senator Townsend commented that is a legal point. The federal government can always request information, but whether or not it is immediately handed over is another question. There have been requests in the past that have been argued against and have not been followed up on. The Senator said that he agreed that the Task Force cannot promise it will not happen, but he pointed out that the DMV and State Police are being funded by the legislature and would have some reason to honor whatever Trust Act would be developed. The Senator wanted to know if the other Task Force members thought having a Trust Act would really make a difference.

Senator Pettyjohn said he was not sure that having a Trust Act would solve any issues, especially when in two years there will be another administration in Washington D.C. and they may file to obtain records from the states. He thinks that many states will resist handing over that information and it will be up to the Federal court system. The Senator said the Task Force could say that we will make every effort to keep the information confidential and private but with the understanding if a court of competent jurisdiction says the information must be turned over, then it must be done. The Senator said he thinks having the Trust Act will make people feel more comfortable but that there must be the disclaimer that it cannot be guaranteed that the underlying information will not be shared at some point.

Senator Townsend said that Chief Topping had expressed concerns that a Trust Act could be worded in such a way as to figuratively handcuff police and how they do their job. The Senator said that the Trust Act would be worded in a way that would not tell the police how to do their jobs.

Ms. Velasquez said she would be a strong advocate for the Trust Act if fingerprints are part of the process.

Senator Townsend confirmed that the Trust Act is important.

Ms. Fennell said it would prevent some future agencies from entering into voluntary agreements to disclose that information, which has been done in the past. A court order is a robust tool.

Senator Pettyjohn asked if the Trust Act would be an addition to this bill or a separate thing.

Senator Townsend stated that he thought it would have to be a separate bill, but a companion one that would be run back-to-back. He mentioned perhaps the legislature should pass the Trust Act first.

Mr. Somalo said he would be in favor of the Trust Act being attached or put into the bill.

Darlene Battle, representing the Delaware Alliance for Community Advancement (DACA), said that she was hoping the bill and Trust Act would be together because in Maryland they tried to submit the Trust Act after the bill passed, and then it did not pass. Washington State suggests that it be put together.

Senator Townsend said that in Delaware there are certain rules about what can be included in one bill or not. Multiple things cannot all be in one bill. The Senator said that it could be tried, but it may be difficult to do.

Ms. Fennell said that if it made reference back to the information collected in that DMV bill, then it would be sufficiently related to pass the constitutional test.

Senator Townsend said he would be happy to support a Trust Act that is not so narrow that it only talks about the information in this system but actually talked about information collected

during any interaction with State government. The Senator said that he respected Drew Fennell's suggestion and that they could possibly try including the Trust Act in one bill. It is important to consider how they end up drafting the bill. The Senator said that brings up the point of the Draft Legislation that was submitted yesterday. There will not be a Task Force vote on whether this has to be the final version, and he is very open to suggestions from others. The Senator mentioned that everyone is representing different groups and some have been less vocal than others. He encouraged everyone to be vocal about what a final product or statement should be regarding what the Task Force has concluded.

Ms. Calvachi-Mateyko, said that she preferred to get away from the word "privilege." She said the word "safety" is key and would prefer it to be called a Driving Safety Card.

Senator Townsend said that in reviewing the minutes, he did not consider the name of the card to be as important as other issues, although he understood why Ms. Calvachi-Mateyko does. The language had been chosen by others who had looked at this topic more broadly around the country. The Senator also does view driving as a privilege. It is a privilege for undocumented people to be accepted into the community more formally and more legally. The card is just one example of that. The Senator appreciates Ms. Calvachi-Mateyko's passion on the issue and said that he has equal passion in trying to solve the problem. As reflected in the minutes, words are important, but it is a topic the Task Force got away from over the course of deliberations. He asked the DMV how would this end up unfolding.

Director Cohan said that the DMV studied and took a national look at it. The Director would like to call every driver's license a Driving Privilege Card because it is understood that it is a privilege and if a person does something wrong they need remediation. Privilege is cited throughout Title 21. She understands the issue, but wants to be consistent with current law. Calling the card something different would be counterproductive to the DMV. Director Cohan asked for Mr. Vien's input.

Scott Vien, representing the DMV, said going back to the structure of the bill, he thinks doing it in a single bill is most effective way. He said it is important to marry it thru the balance of the Code. When a person incurs some problem on the road, they lose the privilege to drive. He agreed with Director Cohan's comment that the preference would be to call them all a Privilege Card.

Mr. Cochran said as an attorney that "privilege" and "right" are terms that are clearly defined terms. The Supreme Court has written on the state's ability to regulate driver's licenses and define it as a "privilege." For terms of clarification, "privilege" definitely has a definition.

Senator Townsend said logistically speaking it is not as easy as it sounds to name the card. He apologized if the Task Force has not sorted it out or given it enough attention because words matter and are important. Some people on this Task Force suffer more than others from being labeled.

Ms. Calvachi-Mateyko suggested adding the word “safety” somewhere else.

Senator Townsend referred to the title of the Task Force, “Undocumented Motorist Safety & Insurance Task Force.” He said he understood Ms. Calvachi-Mateyko’s point.

Mr. Torrijos said he wanted to know where all the members of the Task Force stand on the idea of fingerprinting before going any further in discussing how it will be executed and what plan will be developed.

Representative Keeley said she wanted to go back to what she had said about needing a plan and how it will be rolled out. She also pointed out that the handful of legislators that are represented on the Task Force would need to consider the rest of their caucuses and figure out if the votes would actually be there if fingerprinting were or were not included. She did not think that taking a vote at this meeting would finalize the decision. The legislature voting would make that decision. She said having a plan in place if fingerprinting is included is important.

Senator Townsend asked about easier accessibility of fingerprinting.

Representative Keeley said there is a need for a plan for what happens after the Governor signs a bill. The Task Force should have a plan to move and execute the bill. Bills often do not take effect until six months after the legislation has been signed, so that plans can be made. Often much of that is dumped on the state agencies to come up with a plan. Representative Keeley said she thinks the Task Force should help the state agencies come up with the plan.

Senator Townsend said the Draft Legislation has a place holder for the number of days before it would take effect. Some bills take effect quickly while others do not, so as to all things to be put in place. The Senator agreed with Representative Keeley’s comments regarding needing a plan and significant community involvement and education and building confidence in the system. The Senator said the Task Force had hoped to have a very detailed plan in place but that they have not gotten there yet. He said the Task Force is required to submit a report, which can include a statement that says the Task Force acknowledges that a robust plan must be in place and members of the Task Force (including law enforcement) intend to be involved with developing a community education plan. The Senator said they need to determine what the Task Force wants to say about the outcome of the meetings.

Ms. Fennell said there are many unanswered questions, and some of them will be decided upon by people outside of the Task Force. She suggested saying after lengthy discussion there was no consensus, freeing the legislators to exercise their own judgment, but that there be a recommendation of some ongoing work to implement any legislation and educate members of the relevant communities.

Representative Keeley said that she thinks that could happen. She suggested introducing the bill without the fingerprints. She said that realistically the bill would not be discussed until March

but each caucus would have the ability to discuss it. Depending on the votes, an amendment could be added.

Mr. Torrijos said he thinks his community would agree without fingerprints. Without the fingerprinting, the barriers are less.

Senator Townsend asked what is the ultimate outcome of the Task Force. There are a list of findings and a list of recommendations. Mr. Cochran said he agreed with the findings but did not want to cast a vote specifically supporting the recommendations. The Senator said he would be happy to amend or make any changes. He said that the Task Force can add a statement that says that adding the fingerprinting is the pressure point. He said he is open to a vote count or whatever the Task Force is comfortable with.

Mr. Torrijos said he would like to have an open vote.

Senator Townsend said that his guess was that there are many Task Force members who feel that they are not in a position to support anything at this point.

Representative Keeley added that she did not think it was fair to put some people who are representing someone else to vote. She said the best decision for this report is to say there was not a decision.

Representative Miro said he thought would make it difficult to present it to the caucuses.

Representative Keeley said the fingerprinting issue could be left out.

Senator Townsend asked if anyone would object to having the Task Force indicate that overall it is recommending that a Driving Privilege Card system be put in place.

Representative Keeley said that she did not think that the Task Force should put some people in a very awkward position to vote right now.

Ms. Velasquez said it is difficult to represent an entire community. She said the preference regarding fingerprinting is to not have it, however it is not a deal breaker.

Senator Townsend said if the issue of fingerprinting is going to come up at some point—which the Task Force knows it will—then he would prefer to give people a head's up. He would support having something that does mention it but that the group did not reach agreement because it is a tradeoff between ease of application and getting more people signed up versus the anti-fraud provisions and other benefits. The Senator prefers the report to be very clear up front and what the pressure point is and what they need to think about.

Representative Miro said that the feedback that it could take 6 to 8 weeks might be met with the fact that some people have waited six years already.

Ms. Fennell said she shared the concerns about the practicalities and her suggestion is that because we do not know how they will work, what they will cost, or what the barriers are that it would be a problem if put to a vote. However she thinks that there is much consensus on the need for something along the lines of what is well described in the document. The issues surrounding the fingerprinting cannot be addressed because the Task Force does not have all the information needed to make a decision.

Senator Townsend agreed but said that did not answer whether it should be mentioned whatsoever.

Representative Keeley suggested that a smaller group work on the first paragraph as far as the recommendations to figure out a way to say it in a different manner, and then circulate it electronically so that everyone else can read it. It would be very clear that the topic of fingerprinting was discussed without it saying that it was not voted on.

Senator Townsend said he would be happy for Representative Keeley and himself to take the lead on that suggestion, but he would like to have input from the Task Force if the Task Force could not reach a determination.

Representative Keeley agreed and said that we can work on the language. She said that if fingerprinting is included in the legislation and we know that this population is apprehensive about going to a State Police station, then we need to find out more about the viability of mobile print machines and having the information be delivered to the proper system.

Senator Townsend said that they will circulate to the entire Task Force that paragraph amended and/or split, depending on how the drafting works out. The Senator asked if anyone on the Task Force had issue with any other findings or recommendations. Recommendation 2 is that there is a Trust Act. Recommendation 3 is a supportive Education program and Recommendation 4 is that things will change over time and that we should bear that in mind and modify the system as needed.

Representative Keeley suggested including that the Task Force may meet in a smaller group for developing the big communication roll out plan.

Senator Townsend said that paragraph would be circulated as well. He said that the standard would be 48 hours to respond if anyone has issues and no need to respond if there are no issues.

The Senator said that other than that, we are in a position that as long as it is framed that there are no objections to the recommendations and findings, that everyone is in agreement. He further noted the Minutes of the meeting will also be circulated, with all minutes to be included in the report. The report will include this document, as well as an opening letter from Senator Townsend and Representative Keeley. At the end will be attached all the detailed Minutes. The Senator said that because the Task Force will not be meeting again, they will approve the

Minutes via email with the standard being 48 hours to object or provide any kind of comments. The Senator asked if there were any other questions or concerns.

Ms. Calvachi-Mateyko said that she thinks it is important to consider how it is going to be financed and will the money be ready.

Senator Townsend said that at the first meeting it was discussed that there would be upfront costs to the DMV that would hopefully be recouped over time as people sign up for the cards. He mentioned that today other costs were discussed regarding fingerprinting and educational campaigns.

Mr. Torrijos thanked everyone for the hard work and tremendous effort that was put into the process.

Senator Townsend also thanked Task Force members for their work.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:18 p.m.