

## **Pima County Election Integrity Commission**

<http://www.pima.gov/commission/ElectionIntegrity.shtml>

### **Minute Summary**

The Pima County Election Integrity Commission met in regular session on September 16, 2011, at the Pima County Administration Building, Board of Supervisors Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, 130 W. Congress, Tucson, Arizona 85701.

#### **Item 1: Roll Call**

**Present:** Mickey Duniho, Charles Geoffrion, Jim March, John Moffatt, Pat Pecoraro, Ann-Eve Pedersen, Tom Ryan, Barbara Tellman, Arnie Urken, and Benny White.

**Absent:** Drew Spencer

Also in attendance: Brad Nelson, Pima County Elections Department; Mike Dale, Pima County Elections Department; Susan Hankinson, Pima County Elections Department

#### **Item 2: Pledge of Allegiance:**

Those in attendance stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **Item 3: Approval of the August 26, 2011 Minute Summary:**

The summary was reviewed by the members of the Commission. One (1) correction was noted on page 2, paragraph 3, which should have stated *January 31, 2011*. Motion taken to accept the minutes with the one change. Motion unanimously approved.

#### **Item 4: Poll Worker Evaluation Form – Brad Nelson**

Brad Nelson introduces Ms. Susan Hankinson, who has been appointed as the new Compliance Officer for the Pima County Elections Department. Susan has extensive knowledge in the Elections field and will regularly attend meetings to provide updates.

The Pima County Elections Department was asked to combine the current evaluation form with the proposed evaluation form, created by two (2) former EIC members. Mike Dale provides draft copies of the form to the Commission for review. He suggests some questions be deleted, as it's unclear how the questions will be used. Tom Ryan explains that these questions derived from precinct problems, noted from the precinct report card analysis.

The new form will be handed out to the poll workers during their training and copies will be available at all polling places, so each poll worker will have the opportunity to fill out the information. The evaluation forms can be returned with the elections supplies or at a later point in time.

Jim March suggests the evaluation form be integrated with the end-of-day checklist on Election Day. Brad Nelson gives additional ways the form can be provided and completed, but integrating the form with the checklist takes away the anonymity of the evaluation form.

Keeping the evaluation form separate gives the poll worker time to reflect about the day and take their time to fill out the form. Barbara Tellman feels the form is good as it stands. Charles Geoffrion believes discussions on the form are complete, leaving it to Brad and Dale to finalize.

Comments received through the evaluation form are reviewed and placed in a spreadsheet, which have led to good ideas and improvements within the Elections Department, training, and polling facilities. Brad Nelson stresses that the poll workers have gotten better through training and political recruitment. The political parties, themselves, will sometimes remove troubled poll workers who are not doing their job. Overall, the current issues surround campaign workers outside of the 75 foot limit, which is a legal issue. This has resulted in a loss of polling places, as property owners don't want the trouble of campaign problems on their property.

**Item 5: Secretary of State Election Procedures Manual Process – Brad Nelson**

Secretary of State Bennett created a Committee, inviting representatives from all 15 counties, plus the political parties and various groups with interests in election-related activities. Numerous suggested changes were submitted by the representatives, including those which came in via the website.

The final draft of the manual has been released. Brad Nelson explains that not much has changed, although the manual does adhere to legislation that recently passed.

After counties conduct a hand-count audit, they are to complete their audit and report their findings to the Secretary of State's Office, immediately. Brad Nelson agrees to the audit, but he's asked the Secretary of State's Office to consider the fact that several counties have numerous other duties to complete and posting those findings immediately will be troublesome. Brad asked that the audit be posted before the local County canvasses their vote, not necessarily 24 hours following a hand count.

Benny White feels the Secretary of State's Office was not interested in doing more than responding to the statutory changes. There was work done in reference to the polling place observers, but clarifying language in the statutes and rescinding out-of-date statutes were not issues the Secretary of State's Office was interested in addressing.

**Item 6: Election Update – Brad Nelson**

November 8<sup>th</sup> will be Election Day for school districts. Sunnyside School District will have an election for governing board and to continue their override. Vail School District and Continental School District will have a budget increase question, and will utilize the mail-in ballot option. Tanque Verde School District will also have a budget increase question, and will utilize the polling place elections. The Marana School District will have an election to continue their budget override, as well.

Brad Nelson has asked the County School Superintendent as to how they would like to handle accuracy tests; who will mark the tests, who will observe the testing, and who will run the testing process. The Superintendent will take the process under advisement and Brad awaits his direction.

Benny White states that the accuracy certification board is appointed by the Board of Supervisors, according to the Procedures Manual. He does not believe additional action is required by the Board of Supervisor's to allow Accuracy and Certification Board members to be involved in the upcoming school district elections.

Brad Nelson refers to Ann-Eve Pedersen to clarify Title 15, which states that elections, not contained on a county-wide ballot, designate the County Superintendent as the Chief Election Official. Ann-Eve concurs. This would alleviate the need for the appointment to be placed on the Board's agenda.

**Item 7:           Ballot Scanning Pilot Study Draft Letter – Tom Ryan**

Tom Ryan refers the Commission to the final Ballot Scanning Pilot Study Letter.

Tom Ryan has learned that the draft letter, approved by the Commission at the August 26<sup>th</sup> meeting, has also been approved by the County Attorney's Office and County Administrator's Office. Mr. Huckelberry has recommended that the Board of Supervisors direct Staff to prepare correspondence to Secretary of State Bennett, which will be voted on at the September 20<sup>th</sup> Board meeting.

The Board will make a motion directing the County Administrator to forward the letter. The letter will be placed on letterhead and signed by the Board Chairman.

Jim March inquired to the number of companies who may respond to the pilot study RFP. John Moffatt explains that legislation suggests solicitation of three (3) vendors, although three (3) is not required. Jim suggests that the RFP include an open source requirement or require the selected vendor prove that their scanning components consist of off-the-shelf software, as opposed to software customized for the election process.

The RFP will come from the Secretary of State's Office and the EIC will have no control over who is selected, although the EIC's input may be desired.

Tom Ryan explains that Clear Ballot has equipment which is open source and proprietary. Five (5) counties in Florida are conducting pilot studies and should receive Help America Vote Act (HAVA) funds from the Florida Secretary of State's Office to pay for those studies. Tom Ryan will research what counties are included, and send the information to Secretary Bennett's Office, who can refer to Florida's RFP to create one for Arizona's pilot study.

**UPDATE:** The Pima County Board of Supervisors approved a motion to *"request direction to prepare correspondence to the Secretary of State as a preliminary expression of Pima County's interest in participating in the Ballot Scanning Pilot Study. The Board reserves the right to review the final RFP and implementation process prior to approving Pima County's participation in the study."* The letter was sent to the Secretary of State on September 20<sup>th</sup>.

**Item 8:           By-Laws for the Election Integrity Commission – Barbara Tellman & Charles Geoffrion**

Charles Geoffrion refers the Commission to the draft by-laws handout. Commission members review the document and provide their comments.

All changes will be incorporated into another draft. Catherine Hanna will forward those changes to the Commission members for one more review.

**Item 11:           Call to the Audience**

Charles Geoffrion calls to the Audience. No response is noted.

**Item 12:      Next Meeting Date and Time**

The Commission will meet again on Friday, October 21, 2011, at 9:00 am, Pima County Administration Building, First Floor, Board of Supervisors Conference Room, 130 W. Congress, Tucson, Arizona 85701.

**Item 13:      Agenda Items-New Business**

Commission members would like to see an Annual Report template for future reporting to the Board of Supervisors on Commission meetings and activities. John Moffatt and Catherine Hanna will create a template for review at the December EIC meeting.

Arnie Urken inquired about the system specifications for voting systems. He's asked Brad Nelson to update the Commission on the system design and how the Commission can assist in creating those specifications. Brad explained that there is nothing out there to purchase in advance of the 2012 election.

John Moffatt explains that the Secretary of State's Office has a certification team who is researching the possibility of a regional committee, consisting of a group of states to create specifications for the voting center vendors to adhere to.

**Item 14:      Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 10:49 a.m.