

Email received at 5:23 pm. July 29, 2013

From: Harvie Branscomb

To: Al Davidson (Temporary)

Cc: patrickdavis; Carol Tone; Chris Murray; Clarissa Thomas; Evelyn Tileston; Lauren Kingsbery; LTC Mike McGregor; MAJ Kim Ferguson; Martha Tierney; Micki Wadams; Rick Kron; Suzanne Staiert; Johnson, Debra - Clerk and Recorder; George Leing; Faith Gross; Deb Gardner; waynewilliam; Bob Rankin; Elena Nunez

Subject: Email to PPP

Highlights of this email:

- * kudos to Clarissa Thomas, Martha Tierney, Elena Nunez at the 1303 COVAMEC meeting today
- * PPP recognizes value of expert public input, works toward updated certification standard
- * most clerks don't plan to buy equipment within next 5 years- so we have time before UVS
- * I'm concerned that we have not been able to directly invite canvass boards and watchers
- * survey questions could be asked by contractor hired to write a 1303 voting systems report
- * voting systems include the actual processes that control the way they are used
- * huge differences in election practices are key to good UVS decisions - must understand these

The 1303 COVAMEC meeting seems to have finished although the audio stopped suddenly in mid sentence when they were setting the time for the August 12 meeting for 11 AM-1PM (earlier than the usual 1PM meeting time every other Monday).

Clarissa Thomas made two substantial statements to the meeting. Both were admirable. She clearly stated what she believes the goal of the PPP is. What I heard - in a nutshell - is to help CO set a new more modern certification standard for the best possible voting systems with the benefit of public input. I agree that is a good description of a real contribution the PPP can make- and a appropriate place in the regulatory environment to have the effect. Of course I would hold off on writing a RFP until after the public input is in and a new well deliberated certification standard is put in place by the legislature. And there still seems to be no good reason not to take that path.

Clarissa fairly described the differences between those in the public with vast technical experience and those who have almost no experience at all. I liked what she said. I thought she could have explained that the "public" includes experienced watchers, LAT team members and canvass board members who actually do have hands on experience with the voting system in each respective county - whom we would like to see advise us at our meetings and who may be willing to admit to problems that the clerks might not - but that is the one thing I would have added to what I heard. Without us, the full set of voting systems decisions will be made by either clerks and staff or SOS staff. But there is so much relevant experience outside of that narrow group of people. That is why we are meeting and driving around the state.

PPP member Martha Tierney also made a very valuable comment at the 1303 Commission by pointing out the big differences between counties on the printing and storage/provision of ballots at vote centers and polling

places- differences that very much affect choices about the voting system that must be coordinated on a statewide basis if the UVS is to succeed. It is just this kind of difference that I am trying to discover and quantify with my proposed set of technical questions for the survey that has not yet been authorized.

Unfortunately it may turn out that it is the election officials who will have invited the public to our PPP meetings- in which case we may miss members of the public who have a different perspective than what the clerks have already been able to input through their professional association and their membership on the UVS technical committee.

It appears that the UVSAC has advised the SOS to have the RFP go out on October 1 and have results back in December. This means that whatever is learned by the November election (the first under 1303 in most places) will not be able to affect the contents of the RFP. I think that is a mistake. It was revealed in today's meeting that most clerks have responded to the UVSAC survey that they have no intention of buying equipment in the next 5 years. That would give Colorado enough time to perform this transition to a "uniform", "unified" and now as contributed by the SLI contractor - "universal" - voting system with plenty of time for research, consideration and deliberation.

I'd like the PPP to make that point to the Secretary and would have done so myself if given the opportunity at the extra meeting we asked for.

I also heard my survey questions brought up by Commissioner Elena Nunez (*thanks*) in today's meeting. I had written to the SOS staff and COVAMEC co-chairs before the meeting sending them my long list of technical questions for clerks about county election practices. These questions were distributed to 1303 Commissioners in a packet. Those questions are only 1 of the 4 concepts for questions for a survey that I brought to the previous PPP meeting (others are to list the design problems, prioritize the goals, and list contacts of canvass board members, etc.) These technical questions are the questions that Al Davidson rejected on the basis of simply being too long for the clerks to answer. I have since asked Al to get the Dept of State to get the answers to the questions that can be answered through SCORE. I have not heard back. (The question that the UVSAC rejected from the survey is only the "prioritize the goals" question - not understood at today's 1303 meeting.) I was also hoping the "prioritize the goals question" would be on the SOS web site by now as I recall we proposed in our previous PPP meeting. I heard the UVSAC commissioners suggest the question was more suitable for the public to answer. The UVSAC never considered the questions that I proposed to the 1303 Commission today - but this was not understood.

The technical questions about election practice are many but simple and extremely suited to the 1303 Commission mission to write a report about voting systems for September 2. After all the voting system obviously includes not just the apparatus but the procedures actually used in operation. The proposed survey questions get at differences in practices in the various counties and will give us a better understanding of the differences that need to be overcome to achieve "uniformity" or "unification".

The 1303 Commission has hired a company to interview people and write the required report within the month. I am hoping that the 1303 Commission will ask the vendor writing the report to obtain answers to these technical questions. Unfortunately the topic of the survey questions and their rejection was misunderstood at the 1303 meeting and at least for this reason no positive action was taken.

Surely it must be possible for the public participation panel to obtain answers to reasonable and relevant questions. I am considering asking the questions personally to the clerks. However, I hope to address this topic again at the Wednesday meeting to see if the PPP actually can send a survey to the

county officials now that we have more time before the RFP is finalized. Remember though, it is not that much time so the time at each meeting is precious.

Thanks again to Clarissa for her "non-really-a-report" to the 1303 Commission.

This is a public document.

Harvie Branscomb