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Notice of Meeting

Colorado Voter Access and Modernized Elections Commission

Date of Notice: August 8, 2013

Date and Time of Meeting: August 12, 2013, 1:00 p.m.

I. Notice of Colorado Voter Access and Modernized Elections Commission meeting
You are hereby notified that the Colorado Voter Access and Modernized Elections Commission will meet to discuss the items listed below.

The meeting is scheduled for August 12, 2013, at 1:00 p.m. in the Aspen Conference Room, located on the third floor of the Secretary of State’s office at 1700 Broadway, Denver, Colorado 80290.

II. Invitation for public comment
All meetings of the Colorado Voter Access and Modernized Elections Commission are open to the public. To submit comments in writing, please call (303) 894-2200 x6318 for email instructions.

III. Meeting agenda
- Open public comment (Please limit comments to three minutes or less)
- SLI weekly briefing
- Business Practices Subgroup briefing
- Discuss ongoing issues and opportunities
- Set agenda for 8-19 meeting
  - Note: 8-19 meeting will take place from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

IV. Meeting materials
All documents and materials for the Commission meeting are available to the public online. To view or download these materials, visit the Colorado Voter Access and Modernized Elections Commission page on the Secretary of State’s website.

V. Broadcast and audio recording of the meeting
To access audio broadcasts of the Voter Access and Modernized Elections Commission meeting, visit the Audio Broadcasts page on the Secretary of State’s website.

VI. Office contact
If you have any questions or concerns, please contact our office at (303) 894-2200 ext. 6318.
Comments by Harvie Branscomb - 8/12/2013 COVAMEC meeting at 1700 Broadway Denver

The COVAMEC ought to be concerned about what information we need to know to create good public policy around elections during this instance of major change:

- to remedy the side effects of elimination of a hundreds of years old well understood voting method and its infrastructure
- to know the side effects on accuracy, chain of custody, verifiability, privacy of the loss of precinct polling and paper pollbooks
- we do not know the county differences in how our existing equipment was used in either polling place or mail ballot elections – we should find out
- we do not know what different policies each county will want to pursue in attempting to follow the 1303 changes
- major public policy decisions are being made in a non-public process by a quietly resurrected insider advisory group as a sub-committee of COVAMEC
- the business practices subcommittee is willing to allow public access but not committed to it
- it is a subcommittee of unlisted election officials without sufficient representation of the client perspective i.e. the public

What are some of the major public policy decisions about to be made that ought to be made in a fully public forum taking enough time to tease out all the detriments and benefits? Here are a few:

- will stubs be eliminated from ballots using BOD as an excuse or will they be used for important received-ballot-to-voter accounting?
- will flat paper ballots be available at every VSPC?
- will voters see their flat ballot irrevocably counted in front of their eyes as in most precinct polling places?
- can voters simply cast the folded mail-in ballot received at home at a VSPC without the need for signature checking via the mail process?
- is SCORE the replacement for the paper pollbook? Can it provide the same public verifiability?
- will we balance out the number of vote counts plus under and over votes to the number of ballots received as eligible to be counted?
- how will watchers have practical access to every step in the process of conducting elections as required by statute?

- will election officials have more access to identifiable information on a ballot than the public will? If so, how much more and why?

- will election judges be for practical purposes under the control of the partisan elected designated election official?

I expect issues like these to be deliberately decided only after sufficient airing of the plusses and minuses in a fully public process and not by the COVAMEC business practices subcommittee.

Here are some weaknesses of the COVAMEC process and to some degree the UVS process that merit your attention:

1) difficulties accessing deliberations of the COVAMEC and its Sub Committee on Business Practices and UVS committees:

   - public testimony requires physical presence at particular place and particular time - not allowed over the phone.
   - notice of meetings often given at 24 hours advance notice and sometimes less
   - the stored recording on the internet is apparently not downloadable
   - the audio stream often not possible to play
   - it is impossible to verify the audio stream is working before it starts, including after midstream meeting interruptions

All of these are obstacles to public involvement in a crucially important public policy change.

2) no way to make corrections of errors or supplement faulty information or understanding in timely fashion - Examples:

   - treatment of my list of questions on July 29 - a misunderstanding of the PPP questions; which ones were rejected and why
   - Windows2KPro is widely presented without argument as an impetus for rapid replacement - it is not broken or causing failures

An interactive process is needed to make correct decisions. Once a week meetings is helpful but access to the meeting is still difficult and the process is moving too fast. The UVS RFP development is now an interactive process in its final weeks, but only because UVSAC asked for and received a delay and I on the PPP asked for a series of releases of the RFP. But we are not seeing enough of a delay to permit a process that makes decisions based on agreed upon principles such as Los Angeles county is doing in its multi-year process.

3) There exists an apparently widely held consensus that it is OK to make decisions at a very high speed - too fast for complete deliberation
- Paul Craft warned that he is assuming that the legislature knew what it was doing by making the deadlines too short

- Secretary Gessler is also apparently rushing the process to create his RFP even when there is no evidence of pressure to replace other than pressure that is always present- the desire to get away from existing design flaws that are not being aired in public.

- no counties need to buy equipment before 2014; also no counties are planning to purchase all new equipment in next 5 years?

- The UVSAC has argued that the RFP process must obtain responses from vendors in time for legislation to be written for the 2014 legislative session. Why? Is that the correct order of business- is the legislature intended to perform clean-up after the SOS sees the result of his RFP?

-Does that mean that our statutory certification system ought to be decided subject to prior decisions of the Department of State?

That argument seems to be the only one that requires a UVS RFP to be issued on October 1.

I am informed that the Secretary will not listen to further requests for delay. Why not? It is crucial to experience one or better yet at least two 1303 based elections before a RFP is decided upon and issued for any future uniform purchasing of equipment for Colorado. I hope the COVAMEC will agree and make an effective argument to the Secretary.

Harvie Branscomb
Member listed as "advocate" of the CO Secretary of State Uniform Voting System Public Participation Panel

--
Harvie Branscomb
1-970-963-1369
Carbondale, Colorado USA
harvie [at] electionquality.com
(I release my phone number and email for inclusion in the public record)
### Overall Project Status:
- On Track
- Moderate Risk
- High Risk

#### Status Summary
- Statement of Work is signed and work on project has begun
- Scope of project set. Definition of "Voting System" will include only what is included within an EAC certification
- SLI will assess current voting systems and future voting systems as are currently being brought onto the market
- SLI will assess potential funding sources for the implementation of a state wide uniform voting system

#### Accomplishments For the Last Week
- SLI has deployed county surveys, working with Hillary Hall
- SLI is working on identifying state needs
- SLI is working on Current County Needs
- SLI is working on write-up of certified systems for both Colorado and EAC level certifications

#### Plans for Next Week
- SLI will begin to compile County survey returns
- SLI will work on identifying state needs
- SLI will work on funding source analysis

#### Project Dependencies
- It is imperative that SLI receives timely responses to the surveys from each of the counties
- SLI is dependent on the manufacturers to respond to SLI’s cost estimate requests

#### Areas of Concern/Risks
- None.
Agreed upon assumptions:

The following assumptions have been considered by SLI in determining the project effort, timeline and cost estimate:

The client will provide the following support for this project:

- Provide a Colorado DOS contact for questions/interpretations - *Done*
- Provide the final Rule 45 documentation including the identification of changes made, if possible
Provide a list of individuals to contact at the county level for surveys/interviews - Done

Provide a listing of what each county has in terms of:
  - What system is currently being used - Done
  - Number of polling place devices and types - Done
  - Information whether or not central count scanners are used - Done
  - Information regarding hardware failure rates

Provide any known county specific requirements

Provide any known comments/issues related to voting systems

Provide any known future needs of counties related to voting systems

Provide a calendar of known voting events that could be impacted by new implementations

Provide any known sources of funding for voting systems, including past sources

Provide any known information regarding systems that the State may be interested in as part of the assessment for future implementations
SLI Global Solutions has been contracted to work on the Colorado Assessment of Voting System Technology project by the Colorado Voter Access and Modernized Elections Commission. As part of this project, SLI will be reviewing latest technologies and fielded voting systems. The following questions will be used in making recommendations, in conjunction with results of other surveys previously conducted by the Department of State.

Please take a few minutes to answer the questions below.

Any questions or comments can be directed to MSantos@SLIGlobalSolutions.com

1. From a technological perspective, is there any concern that your jurisdiction will not meet the provisions of HB 13-1303, elections by mail with Voter Service and Polling Centers, and Colorado election code through 2013? If so, why/what?

2. From a technological perspective, is there any concern that your jurisdiction will not meet the provisions of HB 13-1303 elections by mail with Voter Service and Polling Centers, and Colorado election code in 2014 or 2015? If so, why/what?

3. What type(s) of devices do you intend to utilize at Polling Centers to implement the new election model as described in HB 13-1303? (precinct count optical scanner, central count optical scanner, DRE, other (please specify))

4. Have you found technical difficulties with your current voting system, in implementing any voting model?

5. What features, if any, would you like to (or must) have in your next system, based on shortcomings of your current system?

6. Will you be issuing paper ballots to voters that want to vote in person at the VSPC or will they be required to vote on a DRE? Will you be preprinting or printing on demand replacement ballots?

7. If you are issuing paper ballots for in-person voters at your VSPC, will you be using ballot on demand in your VSPC? If so what % of your ballots will be printed on demand at the time a voter requests a replacement or wants to vote in person?

8. Are you using a hybrid (combination of pre-printed and on demand ballots) approach to issuing ballots? If so, please describe.
9. Have you used ballot on demand at a vote center or service center in any of your past elections? If so how many elections have you used BOD? Did you also preprint ballots?

10. Do you have any concerns or have you experienced any difficulties with your ballot on demand systems? Any features you would like to see added?
**Issue Tracking**

1. **Security**
   - SOS Agency Plan (new OIT rule)
   - County actions from SOS rules

2. **Business Process**
   - Necessitated by 1303 and Rule Compliance
   - County specific

3. **Needs Assessment Report (61 items)**
   - 3.1 Score Modifications for 2013
   - 3.2 Score rewrite for 2014

5. **Other Department Interfaces**
   - DMV
   - Corrections

6. **NCOA Implementation**

7. **Training**

8. **Rules Updates**

9. **Connectivity and bandwidth**

10. **Needed 2014 Legislation**

11. **Mock Election Issues**

12. **UVS Study Issues**

13. **Recall Election Issues**

14. **November Election Issues**

15. **Public Input**