

Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on a Uniform Voting System

February 8, 2013 Meeting Summary

Members Attending:

Deborah Johnson, Denver County Clerk
Wayne Williams, El Paso County Clerk
Sheila Reiner, Mesa County Clerk
Connie Ingmire, Morgan County Clerk
Deb Gardner, Boulder County Commissioner
Donetta Davidson, Executive Director, Colorado County Clerks' Association

Staff attending included: Judd Choate, Elections Division Director; Wayne Munster, Elections Division Deputy Director; Christi McElveen, Voting Systems Manager; Al Davidson, UVS Project Lead; Stefanie Mann, Legal Specialist; and Jerome Lovato, Voting Systems SME.

1. The meeting was called to order by Acting Chair Wayne Munster.

Nominations were accepted and a vote held for a permanent Committee Chair. Denver County Clerk Deborah Johnson was elected unanimously. Deputy Director Munster will perform the duties of Facilitator.

2. Discussion points submitted by Committee Members generated comments:

- Current equipment can not meet Risk Limiting Audit Requirements. Waivers are available from the Secretary of State if necessary.
- At least one large county can not meet the requirements for a Voter Verifiable Paper Audit Trail. Action will be needed prior to the next election.

3. Discussion on whether the approach to implementing a UVS should be a hard "cutover" or a "phase-in" approach.

Points made included:

- Funding is primary issue.
- It is difficult to justify shelving equipment that is still functional.
- We need to know what kind of election we are conducting (mail vs. polling site).
- We need the same types of equipment whether conducting mail or polling election, only the quantities of each type will be different.
- A phase-in has a lot of non-uniformity.
- We need scalability and confirmation of consistency over a period of time from vendors.
- Are we being pro-active in outlining requirements that reflect the kind of system we want for the future?
- We are bound by current statutes.
- We may need legislative changes so we shouldn't restrict ourselves with current statutory or regulatory requirements.

4. Discussion was held on Definition of a UVS and Statement of Scope

- Members asked for a more generic definition so as not to restrict the submissions.
- Members asked for electronic copies of Definition and Scope documents to be able to provide edits. Edits need to be to staff by 2-28 to prepare for the March 1 Advisory Committee meeting.
- Members asked staff to include language clarifying the Committee's role in "Advising" the Secretary of State, more specifically stating the process for putting recommendations on the record.

5. Technical Working Group

Items 6 and 7 on the Agenda, relating to the Technical Working Group (TWG) were postponed to a future meeting. The suggestion was made that at least one non-government technical person, perhaps one experienced in RFP development, should be included on the TWG.

6. Discussion of Request for Information (RFI)

Members asked for:

- A better explanation of the meaning of single vendor and multiple vendors
- Add a statement requiring integration with existing equipment
- Focus on processes and procedures rather than specific equipment
- In addition to sending the RFI to the current list of approximately 40 identified vendors, the RFI should be promoted through the Election Assistance Commission (EAC), ElectionLine, The Election Center, National Association of Counties (NACO), National Association of State Election Directors (NASSED), International Association of Clerks Recorders Election Officials and Treasurers (IACREOT) as well as any other organizations that may have vendor contacts.
- Donetta will assist in distribution.
- Any suggested edits to the RFI must be submitted by close of business on 2-12-13.

7. Discussion of potential Third Party provision of services.

Documents from Georgia, Connecticut and Indiana relating to the provision of election services by third parties, primarily universities, were reviewed and discussed.

Points made by members included:

- We need to determine how Colorado will provide election support.
- Need to identify the advantages and disadvantages of contracting with a third party.
- Consider releasing an RFI on provision of services.
- If Colorado chose to use the University of Colorado, we would need to guarantee independence from the members of the Board of Regents, who are elected on a partisan basis.

- Term limitations on County Clerks and the Secretary of State are reasons to seriously consider a third party service provider that would be consistent through the leadership changes.
- Staff needs to bring more information on the process of “parallel testing”.
- Need to define what services would be included in any third party involvement.

Motion was made by Chair Deborah Johnson and seconded by Donetta Davidson to direct staff to study the three options for support (vendor/county, State Department, third party) and report back on the advantages and disadvantages of each. The motion also included direction to begin drafting a Request for Information (RFI) for the provision of support services.

Motion carried unanimously.

8. Committee Meeting Schedule

Due to a scheduling conflict the meeting originally scheduled for April 12, 2013 was rescheduled to April 5, 2013.

Next meeting will be held in the Aspen Room in the Secretary of State’s building at 1700 Broadway in Denver from 12:00 noon to 3:00 p.m. on Friday, March 1, 2013.

9. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Johnson.