

**DRAFT**  
**Summary of Uniform Voting System (UVS) Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**July 18, 2013**

Meeting held in the Aspen Conference Room, in the offices of the Secretary of State, 1700 Broadway St. Denver.

Chair Debra Johnson, Denver County Clerk and Recorder called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

**Discussion of the UVS Request for Proposal.**

The following points were made in this discussion by the members:

- Committee should recommend that UVS be implemented as an “opt-in” process rather than a mandatory with grandfathering for a specified time as described by Secretary Gessler previously.
- If the grandfathering approach is taken by the Secretary of State, it should be clear that some items are opt-in. Those should be listed.
- Equipment needs are not as serious under the new election model as before, because fewer pieces of equipment are needed. This will create surpluses of equipment in some areas which will result in a longer lifespan for existing equipment.
- Leasing equipment should be an option, specifically for the Ballot on Demand equipment.
- A concern was expressed over UVS components ability to work together seamlessly.
- No significant immediate need exists for equipment under the new election model.
- Funding is not available for equipment.
- Implementing over a period of years will cause a lack of uniformity.
- The process should be slowed down, at least by a couple of months.
- Legislation is needed for state funding as well as the ability to buy equipment that meets the 2005 VVSG standards of the EAC. These are the last federally approved, standards; however Colorado law specifies 2002 VVSG standards. Neither the 2002 VVSG nor 2005 VVSG adequately address accessibility. The pending version of the standards is much better relating to accessibility; however the EAC Commission has no members and is unable to approve the pending version.
- Need to ask vendor to what standards they are certified.
- The Public Participation Panel is trying to determine prices on voting systems.

- Counties should not be required to replace properly working equipment.
- The process should be slowed down. Don't need to hold for legislation. RFP may have an impact on what legislation is needed.
- We don't know how much equipment we will need until we have been through some elections.
- We need to begin looking to Legislative action to support standards changes and discuss state funding.
- 2013 Elections will be instructive in evaluating responses to RFP.
- Recommend delay to October 1 with return by December 2, 2013. (Vote was 7-1 in favor) Motion made by Member Williams, and seconded by Member Gardner.
- Letter will be sent to Secretary saying the Committee unanimously supports a delay in issuing an RFP and by a 7-1 vote approved the October 1 – December 2 delay.
- We don't know how much equipment we will need until we have been through some elections and we won't be able to tell vendors how much equipment we will need in any given timeframe.
- Many variables may not be known in time for RFP issue.
- Variables may be better known in time for evaluation of RFP responses.
- In most cases where state systems are implemented the state pays for the systems.
- There is an issue with the state mandating the purchase of specific equipment with county money.
- The Secretary has the authority to determine what counties can purchase, but may not have authority to require counties to buy equipment before they are ready.
- The committee agreed that the items indicated in red on the chart of items the committee and staff have discussed at prior meetings, should not be mandatory, but should be optional for counties to purchase those items from any vendor not a vendor specified by the Secretary of State. These items should be included in the RFP but counties would not be required to purchase from any vendor that might be recommended by the State. Those items represent a "catalogue of services".
- Does needing an upgrade to present equipment trigger a mandatory purchase of a different system from a state approved UVS vendor? Consensus was that it does not.
- 47 Hart counties may need to upgrade their Windows platform.

## Draft System Requirements

The Committee reviewed the draft system requirements. Len Vest, RFP Contract Writer advised the Committee in of changes made to the draft based on public comments and staff questions.

### Committee member comments

- Add when responding to five categories use only whole numbers.
- Should clarify what is meant by “global edits”
- Need to send out edited document for UVSAC review
- Question about sequential numbering to make sure refers only to numbering stubs.
- We need to require font sets that allow Spanish character sets to be used in ballot layout
- Reports should reflect the state’s “fewer than 10 voter” standard. (A-45 item refers to every report that is produced. Needs to be reflected in items 32 – 36). (significant discussion).
- A-49 should reference multiple candidates where more than one candidate can be elected.
- B-7 new concept. Good option.
- Suggestion that we address counting “non-pristine” ballots in scanning (both in B and C)
- C-6 refer to Technical Volunteers
- Check for reference to two-sided ballots scanning
- Check for definition of “high speed”
- Ask for throughput rate of central scanner
- (D) Competing interest in making sure that voter can verify they have the correct ballot on an electronic voting device/voters with disabilities don’t want to wade through a full preview. Need way to let voters with disabilities to rapidly scan through any preliminary contest listing.
- Accessibility standards in “pending” version are the best references to use.
- D 12-D-13 – add following the printing of a marked ballot the machine must reset (BMD) (Hart recommendation)
- In E check definition of counties sizes as referenced in HB 1303
- Ask if there is a solution as an alternative to hand removal of signature tabs

The August 8th Committee meeting was cancelled due to conflict with Presidential Commission meeting in Denver.

The next meeting is scheduled for August 29. Survey results to be presented.

Al will email members with reminder of Public Meeting Law requirements.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.