

**DRAFT**  
**Summary of Uniform Voting System Advisory Committee (UVSAC) Meeting**  
**Aspen Room, Offices of the Secretary of State**  
**September 19, 2013**

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:13 p.m.

Secretary's staff and Committee members offered tributes to Member Faith Gross who is retiring and will not be serving on this Advisory Committee after this meeting. Her replacement on the Committee is Jennifer Levin who is also her replacement in her professional position as an advocate for people with disabilities.

Deputy Secretary of State Suzanne Staiert addressed the Committee on the issue of funding a UVS and providing a governance structure for the distribution of funds.

Staiert made several points:

- Federal HAVA funds paid for most current equipment.
- No HAVA funds are now available.
- HAVA funds were disbursed through Secretary of State's Office.
- Need to address how will funding be allocated for UVS?
- Need a coalition of organizations to seek funds in the Legislature .
- There may need to be a committee to oversee disbursements (model of CSTARs?).
- Secretary of State's office has no General Funds.
- Funds could be distributed by DOLA.

D. Davidson commended Staiert for her openness and made several points:

- Legislation should cover governance, authority, and certification.
- There may not be any General Funds available for UVS because of natural disasters.

Williams commented:

- CSTARs is not a good model.
- Hard to get appropriation for technology.
- All counties need to be involved in the process.
- Need to provide for expansion.

D. Davidson: CSTARs may not be appropriate, but there should be a committee of County representatives involved.

Williams: Weed a fair process however; which agency distributes the funds is not a major factor.

Reiner comments:

- Need to define the customer – County or State.
- Who is the contractor with the vendor?
- Timeline needs to be revisited before requesting legislative approval.

Johnson Comments:

- Governance needs to be decided before seeking funding.
- Clerks and SOS need to agree on a funding proposal and go to Legislature together.
- Need to plan dollar allocation over several years as Counties join the system.
- Counties need to have a stake in funding with either a match or a contribution.

Williams:

- Prefers county match approach.
- Need to know overall costs before approaching Legislature for funding.

Johnson: Need a pilot election with UVS system, perhaps in 2015.

Leing: Need to develop metrics to measure success of pilot election.

Staiert: This year need to focus on Governance.

Chair Johnson formed Subcommittee on Legislation and Governance to formulate a plan for full Committee consideration. Members include: Donetta Davidson, Sheila Reiner, and Wayne Williams.

The Subcommittee will review California passed legislation (SB 360) for ideas for Colorado legislation.

### Report from SLI Global Solutions

Staiert, as Co-Chair of Colorado Voter Access and Modernized Election Commission (COVAMEC) discussed SLI's Assessment of Voting System Technology Report submitted to COVAMEC.

- The report was mandated by HB 13-1303.
- COVAMEC discussed funding in accepting the SLI report.
- This report was prepared for the Legislature so it is less technical than previous work done by UVS Advisory Committee.
- Vendors did not respond to cost of equipment questions because of impending RFP.

Several Committee Members expressed concern over the report's negative portrayal of the status of voting equipment in Counties. The primary concern is that the SLI report does not recognize upgrades that have been installed in existing voting systems since the initial deployment of those systems.

Committee Members believe that the County Clerks' Association should release a statement to assure the public that the voting equipment is working properly.

Staiert:

- It may be possible for COVAMEC to add an addendum to report to reflect the upgraded equipment status.
- SLI had limited time to prepare report because of date requirement in HB 1303 Commission will probably not act on SLI report but will send report to Legislature.

Johnson suggested that system deficiencies identified in the report should be used in evaluating responses to the RFP to assure that any valid current issues identified in the report are rectified with new system.

Chair Johnson called for a break at 2:13 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 2:30 p.m.

Public Participation Panel (PPP) Update from UVS Committee Liaison Leing.

He reported a lack of public participation at meetings outside of Denver.

- Final meeting moved back to Denver and Panel will take telephone testimony.
- Indicated that Panel was evaluating future role.
- On behalf of UVS AC Leing expressed to the PPP that it serves valuable functions.

Gross discussed disappointment in public turnout at Pueblo meeting at which she represented the Advisory Committee in Leing's absence.

Williams commented that it is important that the public was offered the opportunity to participate, through the PPP process, even if participation was disappointing.

A. Davidson reported that the Panel is discussing "what next" issues:

- A report to Secretary Gessler on the Panel's work to date is being prepared.
- The Panel members have been actively involved in the RFP System Requirements development process.
- PPP members are also commenting on the proposed rule changes.

Comments of Committee Members on RFP System Requirements:

Gross:

- Remove D-16 large print reference.
- D-37 – should be electronic instead of touchscreen.
- D-36 – Pleased to see language about accessible review of VVPAT.

A. Davidson gave overview of the System Requirements development process and review, and inclusion of suggestions from the committees, the public and vendors.

### RFP Evaluation Process

Al Davidson:

- The traditional closed model of RFP review process is not consistent with the public outreach element that has been incorporated into this project.
- The evaluation process will include CDOS staff, UVS AC, PPP, and County technical staff.
- Committees will need meeting(s) to review and discuss responses.

Williams:

- After evaluation we may find that no proposed system meets Colorado's needs.
- We may conclude that we want to do pilot elections with one or more proposed systems.

Johnson:

- Agrees with Williams on both statements.
- Need to establish weighting for evaluation criteria.

Reiner: Appreciated vendor input in the Systems Requirement development process.

Williams:

- Not sure giving numeric weight to each requirement is appropriate.
- Need to look qualitatively. (E.g. If it doesn't count ballots accurately it doesn't matter what else it can do.)

Gross:

- Previously participated in RFP review and it is very challenging.
- Need to be able to validate RFP claims in demonstrations.
- Need to understand and review what the vendor is saying the system is able to do.

Johnson: Need to remember who is going to be the customer.

A. Davidson: Contract for pricing to be with State; implementation agreement with Counties.

Johnson: Need to separate proposals by vendors who are responding only to specific items and not the whole system.

Gross: Should slow the process down. State should not be issuing the RFP on October 1.

Reiner: Agrees with Gross.

Williams: Need RFP process before legislation.

D. Davidson: Need to change legislation to allow certification to current standards.

Gross: Agrees with need to update legislation on certification standards.

### Next Meetings

- October 17 – 12:00 Noon.
- No meeting in November because of Election.
- December 12 – noon Review of RFP Responses.

The Subcommittee on Governance and Legislation will meet prior to October 17.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:17 p.m.