

MEETING SUMMARY – December 14, 2012

The Pima County Election Integrity Commission met in regular session on December 14, 2012, in the Pima County Administration Building, Pima County Board of Supervisors 1st Floor Conference Room, 130 W. Congress, Tucson, Arizona 85701.

ITEM 1. ROLL CALL

Present: Charles Geoffrion, Arnie Urken, John Moffatt, Pat Pecoraro, Tom Ryan, Barbara Tellman, Elaine Lim, and Benny White. Mickey Duniho arrived at 9:10 am

Absent: Jim March

Also in attendance: Brad Nelson, Pima County Elections Department, F. Ann Rodriguez and Chris Roads, Pima County Recorder's Office and Carli Brousseau, Arizona Daily Star.

ITEM 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Those in attendance stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

ITEM 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTE SUMMARIES

Charles Geoffrion reported that the Meeting Summaries for September 21, 2012 (Amended), October 19 and 26, 2012 were distributed electronically and asked if there were any changes or comments. With no discussion, it was moved by Pat Pecoraro, seconded by Barbara Tellman and unanimously carried, to approve the Summaries as submitted.

ITEM 4. MEMBERSHIP ATTENDANCE UPDATE – Charles Geoffrion

Charles distributed an attendance spreadsheet for the year to insure compliance with Commission policies and by-laws. He then took the opportunity to introduce Elaine Lim as the newest Member and representative for District 5, and welcomed her to the Commission.

ITEM 5. BALLOT SCANNING PILOT STUDY – Tom Ryan (Continued)
Clear Ballot Presentation by Larry Moore (Telephone Conference at 9:30 am)

Larry Moore, from Clear Ballot (CB), presented a telephonic presentation with on-line visual graphics regarding recent enhancements to their product related to the Ballot

Scanning Pilot Study. He stated that his presentation would be brief to allow sufficient time for questions, answers and comments.

The Clear Ballot technology has been used and refined over the course of efforts required by the Florida project, continuing in New York State, and in their upcoming project scheduled to begin in Colorado in January, 2013. CB has successfully developed compatibility with the County's Premier Software and is based on the use of pdf files. Their system is also compatible Premier, ES&S, Sequoia and Dominion as well, and will complete the package with Hart InterCivic on the Colorado project. Larry explained that there are basically three stages to the audit process:

1. Pima County provides CB with pdf files which is the only input requirement other than the scanning of the voter ballots. CB then tests and converts the pdfs into their version of Ballot Definition Files (BDF), and from those pdf files alone, the Election can be defined.
2. CB will run a demonstration with the assistance of the Pima County Elections Department where, with the presence of the BDFs, clear ballots are scanned into one or more scanners (if there is more than one they are networked together) culminating in near instantaneous results after the last ballot is processed.
3. Once results are up on screen, diagnostic, reporting and communication tools can be used to provide information on the results of the election and audits.

The presentation and discussion included the following other topics:

- Auditing framework has been developed into a single audit report that shows information about the election data, ballot reconciliation and indexes which compare their system versus the primary voting system. If there are mismatches, diagnostic tools of two types are used to (1) resolve ballot discrepancies and (2) to resolve auditing discrepancies. Once discrepancies are resolved, information can be communicated to the public or candidates via a Comparison of Votes Cast Report, generated by the software.
- A variety of links provide available reports, election data, and ballot scanning operations. Most importantly, tools are also available to perform ballot reconciliation where discrepancies on the ballot count exist between the primary voting system and the CB's election verification system. The system not only pinpoints where the discrepancies can be found, but can break out every candidate and identifies individual votes.
- Since October of last year, Clear Ballot has made 4 separate trips to Florida, visiting in 7 counties, in which they have run through 27 General, Primary, Presidential Preference Primaries or Special Elections. They have dealt with the complexities of the Primaries and the scale of Generals and have processed approximately 1.6M ballots of different sizes including a two card ballot.

- Their scanners have the ability to scan 8.5 x 11 inch landscape ballots at a rate of 5,000 ballots per hour, and other sizes up to 22" at a rate averaging 2,800 to 3,200 per hour per scanner. This is the optimum scanning rate. CB has networked up to 10 scanners with sustained movement of approximately 30,000 ballots per hour.
- Three voting systems were audited in Florida and next week CB will go to Monroe County in Rochester, New York to audit their audits of 330,000 ballots that were cast in that Election. New York State is becoming increasingly interested in the CB system and has asked CB to take it through a more rigorous certification during the first half of next year. Rigorous certification is defined as certification for a central count voting system which includes formal code review, functionality review for the State Board of Elections which they do on their own, and meeting requirements for an audit system that they have consecrated. The count could be used for a recount and will enhance CB's credibility.
- Election Supervisors say that a key benefit of this product is that they receive near instantaneous feedback on ballot counting, so if there are issues, they can be located and fixed in a hurry. The software helps to determine, locate and account for discrepancies.
- CB's system has been compared with the new versions of election tabulation software that does graphical scanning. CB produces images of a higher resolution than the new primary election tabulation software systems.

Costs

- Florida's Secretary of State authorized funding through two separate allocations from their HAVA dollars. Arizona has these allocations as well.
- One software license runs \$.35 to \$.45 per registered voter depending upon the size of the jurisdiction
- Annual report and creation of the BDFs runs 10 to 15 cents per registered voter per year (most likely the lower amount will prevail because of the number of smaller Precincts)
- The cost of a High Speed/High Definition Scanner is \$15,200
- 3 year onsite support cost is \$9,200 per scanner (roughly \$3,000 per year for 3 years)
- Prices are competitive with what other scanners are running.

Ball Park costs for Pima County:

- Licensing Fees: Based on 485,000 active registered voters, with a base cost of \$.35 per registered voter is approximately \$170,000 plus an annual support cost approaching \$50,000 at \$.10 per registered voter for a projected annual cost of \$220,000.
- Equipment Costs: The first year's annual equipment (scanners) cost would be included with the \$30,400 purchase and the 2nd and 3rd year would be \$3,000 per year per scanner.
- Set up, including calibration: Would be included in the onsite support number. There would be additional out of pocket costs for covering the first Election.

General Discussion:

It was estimated that two scanners would be needed for Pima County.

Brad mentioned that he cannot start scanning ballots until he has a successful Logic and Accuracy Test (LAAT) which usually happens about seven days before the Election. Larry described the ability of their system to perform the LAAT very quickly.

Barbara asked if any jurisdiction was looking at this as the main way of tabulating early ballots rather than the audit. Larry responded that New York State is moving in this direction and that is why they have asked CB to go through the certification process.

Charles asked, based on the 7 day window related to the LAAT, would they still be looking at two machines. Larry felt that an argument that there is nothing to prevent scanning prior to the LAAT could be advanced. Some of the Members disagreed.

Brad asked how soon CB would need the BDFs to begin their work and Larry responded that once the uniform structure was set for the Election, they could have the BDF files on Premier back in hours; however, one day would be the worst case scenario based on a scanning rate of 1 ballot every 10 seconds for 400 Precincts.

Note: Pima County has multiple ballots per precinct in Primary and most General Elections. At the projected rate, this still should not exceed 1-2 days.

A general discussion occurred regarding what type of voter registration is used and how numbers of voters are determined considering Election fluctuations. Larry reported that in other Counties, they have used an average of the midterm and General Election numbers. In the case of the difference in the types of voter registration, the lower number would be used. He also noted that there is no cost for additional Elections – including contracted elections.

Arnie asked if Pima County could contract with smaller counties to perform their audits under this license and Larry responded that they could. He felt that doing so would save States across the country significant money and suggested a more in-depth follow up conversation on this subject at a later time.

Mickey Duniho asked if CB obtained certification for audit capabilities, would it alter the price and Larry responded that it would due to the cost of certification. He commented that the future of voting systems is that the technology that relies on sorting versus scanning needs to die because of the costs that are associated with this process which used to require days will now take minutes.

Charles inquired where Clear Ballot is with respect to its competition, and Larry responded that the system developed for Humboldt County was the only one. CB also now has independent, non-partisan funding that lends more flexibility to their service and development.

Benny and Arnie discussed issues pertaining to ballot folds, duplication and editing of ballots, returning edited ballots to the system. When asked if there system fails, Larry responded that it does; however, the software provides the ability to locate that registered error, correct it, and produce a report on all errors county-wide.

John mentioned that the law states that results cannot be released early. With respect to that, he asked what kind of logging and tracking systems CB has to prove that information was not produced or released early. Larry answered that, although he would not recommend it, a process of scanning ballots to a laptop with no tabulation and then when ready turning on the tabulators for processing, putting the information on the server and then running the tabulations could be done. His reasons for not recommending this process are that the tabulation process moves as quickly as the scanning. If you have scanned the ballots to the laptop, it would then take more time to tabulate would not allow receiving instantaneous results and the process could take up to a one-half day longer. Additional pros and cons of using this process were discussed.

Benny inquired about the process for comparing original and duplicate ballots which often times is important in tight races. Larry explained the current process and stated in the future, the system would be able to present a visual overlay on how the human adjudicated the corrections, and the corrections will be reflected in a report. He noted that remaking is one of the most complex portions of the product and they spend a lot of time to make the system fast and bullet proof.

Mickey asked about the cost of proceeding with the trial experiment, and Larry responded that CB would request a reasonable stipend and reimbursement of out of pocket costs.

John commented that the pilot study makes sense but expressed his reasons and concerns that lead him to believe that the Secretary of State is not on board with this process, even though correspondence has indicated that Pima County can proceed with the pilot at their own cost. He also felt that even if the pilot was successful, there were some legal constraints with the Legislature that have to be overcome. Larry responded that as long as the Commission continues with their good faith effort, that eventually the increase in transparency and reduction in costs many help support change with the Secretary of State. He offered to meet with and/or talk to the Secretary of State at the upcoming National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS) meeting in January in Washington, DC. He also encouraged Brad Nelson to call Bob Warren, the Director of Election Certification for New York State, for his input.

Tom Ryan asked if CB receives State Certification in New York and they become basically a central count system, how they would propose auditing their system. Larry responded that in addition to the evaluation trials in Colorado, the main reason they want to do this was to evaluate the risk limiting technology that Dr. Phil Stark is piloting. His technology requires a single ballot vote cast record which is what CB

produces and makes audit systems much more efficient than without it. The outcome of the work in Colorado will help produce the answer to that question in the near future.

Benny proposed that a subcommittee be formed to enhance EIC's recommendation to the Secretary of State that Pima County participate in a pilot and also work with the Secretary of State's Office directly to find out, what, if any, objections they have, and what kind of legal constraints that they anticipate, and see if these issues can be overcome and this process can be moved forward.

Benny expressed his appreciation to Larry for their progress and the presentation ended and Charles requested that the session be closed and called for a formal motion from Benny.

It was moved by Benny White, seconded by Arnie Urken, and unanimously carried to form a subcommittee of at least 3 people to work on a recommendation as a follow up to what the Board of Supervisors proposed in their meeting of a few weeks ago, to enhance that recommendation to incorporate the lessons learned in this past Election, and to augment the arguments as to why this would be a benefit to the integrity and public confidence in our Elections.

Barbara stated that she wanted to make a similar motion towards the end of the meeting with broader jurisdiction. Benny preferred that the motion be kept separate. Benny, Tom and Arnie volunteered to serve on the subcommittee, and John agreed to participate as the liaison with the Board of Supervisors.

ITEM 6.

GENERAL ELECTION UPDATE – ELECTIONS AND RECORDER'S OFFICE – Benny White

- Discussion of Printing or Database Errors For Voting Area Materials, Including Precinct Registers and Signature Rosters During the November 6, 2012 Election – Benny White
- Discussion Regarding Procedures and Policies of the Recorder's Office and the Election Department in Response to Errors or Emergencies That May Occur During the Conduct of an Election on Election Day With Emphasis on Implications for Department Staff, Election Board Workers and Voter Turnout and the Ability of a Registered Voter to Vote – Benny White
- Report from Republican Party Observers

Benny White reported that F. Ann Rodriguez had already responded to a number of his concerns through her various press releases, but he requested further discussion on the printing errors on the Precinct Registers and Signature Rosters; and the problems with the current emergency phone system which was used to activate an emergency phone bank.

The following is a summary of comments offered by F. Ann Rodriguez:
Printing and Database Errors

- Provisional Ballot problems were experienced Statewide.
- Press releases were distributed to the public and the EIC addressing the problems with the Pima County Precinct Registers and Signature Rosters.
- The associated software program failed to clear out one field and caused the system to produce an incomplete alphabetical sort.
- Staff changes and new procedures in the Recorder's Office have been implemented to increase accuracy and quality control.
- Software issues affecting the alphabetical sorting of rosters impacted approximately 1500 voters (representing 5% of the total votes) who had to vote Provisional Ballots. The yellow card sort was correct
- The Recorder's Office has been inundated with public records requests from the public, parties and media which required immediate attention; however, affected Provisional Ballot voters will be getting a letter from the Recorder in the near future.

Other Issues

F. Ann commented on the following and invited John Moffatt to contribute as he was on site at the Emergency Phone Bank.

- 27 staff members managed phones in the Recorder's Office on Election Day, in addition to 10 County volunteers arranged by John Moffatt to staff an Emergency Phone Bank in the old Emergency Operations Center.
- The Recorder's Office became inundated with walk-in voters who requested assistance with their ballots, information on polling place locations or the status of their voter registration which required the assistance of 5 staff members.
- The volume of phone calls coming in and holding in the queue ultimately affected trunk lines throughout the entire County.
- An Emergency Phone Bank was set up initially with 10 employee volunteers who took calls from poll workers to help locate the proper polling places for voters who had questions or whose names could not be located on the rosters. This number was expanded later in the day as demand grew.
- Although this issue seemed substantial in magnitude, it is important to note that 255,000 Early Ballot requests were returned and approximately 100,000 voters showed up at the appropriate polling place without any problems.
- F. Ann advised the Secretary of State that it is important to purchase media statewide to promote the education of this small group of voters who wait until the last minute and are unsure of how to proceed with the voting process. She will also make a similar request to the Board of Supervisors for education on the local level in addition to funding for other short and long term solutions.
- In response to a question about how many voters did not vote or have their vote counted due to time constraints, F. Ann responded that in the cases where voters have allocated insufficient time for voting in a Presidential Election on Election Day, little can be done at the last minute when a problem occurs. She was unclear on the total number of people who walked out the door without voting.

- It was noted that the problems with people not voting were not just related to the rosters, but registration and other issues as well.
- Smart Phone based system seems to be the trend, and the Recorder's Office is currently taking steps to test this type of platform in the 2014 Election or in a Special Election, whichever comes first.
- Maricopa County recently experienced some problems resulting from various activists giving out incorrect polling place location information over the phone which further emphasized the importance of public information needing to be accurate and accessible. The Recorder, Elections and Secretary of State's websites have accurate information available 24-7. However, other information resources need to be expanded, and the process is already in the planning and inventory stages in the Recorder's Office.
- It is a challenge to get people accustomed to moving forward with technology because there will always be those individuals who prefer not to participate; consequently, the old technology needs to remain in place.
- The Recorder's Office had tried to avoid as many potential problems at the polls by staying open on Saturday before Election Day.

Phone System

- Phone calls received by the Recorder's staff primarily pertained to information that had already been provided to the voter to help them avoid having to vote with a Provisional Ballot—leaving the question of how you get voters to pay attention to the correspondence they receive.
- Changes to the current phone system need to include the ability to tell where the caller is in relationship to the total number of people in the queue, as well as how long they have been on the phone.
- Poll workers reported 20-30 minute delays in reaching someone when calling in, and that the phone service was up and down.
- Part of the phone problems related to the number of callers who hung up and immediately called again which added to the trunk line load and helped to take the system down. Approximately 8,000 calls came in and 4,000 were abandoned, but the time on hold (which averaged 60-90 seconds) was surprisingly short
- The Emergency Phone Bank was manned by approximately 10 people at a time who answered calls from Precinct Poll Workers, as well as those in the field, and maintained constant call loads during the time that the system was up and running. Unfortunately, this system failed at approximately 4:45 as the evening peak time was approaching.
- For the next major Election, F. Ann suggested that 15 to 20 people from other Departments be recruited to go to the Country Club location to help direct the voters based on information on the website as these people are accustomed to working with the public in a business environment and have the ability to maintain control of situations.
- Training of the volunteers at the Emergency Phone Bank was conducted by Brad Nelson who remained on site to field other questions. The process basically required accessing the Recorder's Office or Elections Department data bases to

obtain appropriate polling place information for the Precinct Poll Workers based on the addresses provided by the voters.

John reported that Pima County is implementing a new phone system in phases and that part of the problem on that day was that all of the calls came into the same trunk lines. IT and other staff are working on ways to resolve and prevent the situation from reoccurring which could include additional trunk and overflow lines. He noted that the existing 25 year old EOC phone system was originally set up for random calls out, not thousands of calls coming in. At one point the T1 line quit working which caused some concern because that is where phone calls come during an emergency situation. He noted that he did have more detailed information relating to the trunk line failure components if anyone wished to receive and review the data. He stated that some of the issues had to be attributed to bad timing due to the relocation of the Emergency Operations Center to its new facility which was going to occur in the next few weeks.

Other Topics of Discussion

- Mickey and F. Ann discussed a difference of opinion in the law's requirement to only allow a voter to cast their vote for the candidates who represent them where they live and not at other locations.
- In the future, the Recorder's phone messages could be more dynamic and provide more information for the voters. F. Ann noted that they were also looking at using local businesses and agencies to help provide voter assistance information.
- F. Ann noted that the Recorders throughout the State are meeting with key Legislators and preparing recommendations to present to the Secretary of State on various issues affecting Counties Statewide. She noted that costs and manpower to process Provisional Ballots is exorbitant, discussed the need to put the responsibility back on the voters, and noted that that one of the quick fixes to enhance voter registration is to use the Motor Vehicle Division process for voter registration with modifications to make it simpler and clear to the average person.
- F. Ann commented on the professional demeanor of the party observers during the Election, the great opportunities that presented themselves to work with and educate the media, and that the open process was very successful.
- Mickey inquired whether the Secretary of State was inclined to move to all mail voting. F. Ann responded that he is not there yet. Chris noted that the people at the State level were still aware of the Proposition that was on the Ballot 8-10 years ago that was overwhelmingly rejected it on a 3-1 vote, and since then, no one has wanted to touch it.
- The Members discussed the merits of adopting vote by mail given the fact that 70-80 percent of the voters already vote early. Some felt that it was the desire of the Counties but not the Legislature.
- Mickey noted that since the Commission has been asked to look at costs of Elections, that elimination of voting polls could save a lot of money. Chris stated that the States are aware of the potential cost savings and are giving the Counties more authority to ease into it to doing what they did in the Presidential Preference Election by taking the smaller Precincts and making them all vote by mail. The cities are getting used to it,

the smaller rural areas will follow and ultimately the ultimate move will be easier. He also commented that there is a vocal segment that feels that you are not voting unless you walk into a polling place. This sentiment is so strong, that even the on line voting site has been redesigned to look more like a voting site. F. Ann noted that this is a move that needs to take place not only because of the cost savings but also the ongoing issues with the Postal Service which is being scaled down substantially.

- Benny offered his assistance and stated the more dollars and cents information that can be provided to the Republican Party the better because of their concern over costs.
- Barbara expressed appreciation for the effort that F. Ann and Brad put into the report cards at the polls. Brad advised that this information is currently being reviewed by the County Administrator and will be available at the next Commission Meeting. F. Ann advised that the Recorder's Office was also preparing a report on their observations that would be forwarded to the Elections Department and Commission as well.
- Charles asked if there was a sense from the Commission that the Recorder is on top off this situation, and were there any other lingering issues to discuss. All members agreed that they were generally comfortable with the direction that the Recorder was moving in and no other issues were brought forward.

Ann and Chris excused themselves from the meeting.

ITEM 7. SECRETARY OF STATE'S RESPONSE TO PILOT STUDY FOR GRAPHICAL SCANNING – Mickey Duniho

Mickey stated that his desired action had already been taken by the Commission. He felt that there were some mixed messages being sent by Members of the Secretary of State's Office which could indicate a failure to communicate within their organization. He suggested that it was important and worthwhile for follow up and communication to promote a reversal of their position on this matter.

ITEM 8. THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S HANDLING OF EIC'S EMERGENCY RECOMMENDATION ON HAND COUNT AUDITS - Mickey Duniho

Mickey expressed that he felt the Commission was disrespected by the County Administrator in his arbitrary delay of the Board of Supervisors consideration of their emergency recommendation, leaving literally no time for serious consideration or implementation. He requested that a formal protest be presented by the Commission to insure that future recommendations not be delayed by other employees.

The Members discussed the need for more clarification in the material submitted, the short time given relative to the process, this was the first time that they made such a request, the legal implications, and that a protest was not the best way to prevent such a problem from occurring again. Mickey thought that the recommendation was clear. Tom Ryan agreed that the time frame was a problem, but was disturbed that the members

were not aware of the requirements in the State's Draft Procedure Manual for sorting of hand ballots which was published in February, was not considered by the Commission. John asked the State why this provision was included, and their response was that they did not take into consideration the effect on the larger Counties. The Members agreed that they needed to be more diligent and Mickey asked, given the language in the draft procedures, was Pima County going to sort Early Ballots. John Moffatt stated that it was his personal opinion that there was not enough of a discrepancy to warrant the time and cost to do so at this time. Mickey cited examples of instances where sorting machines could save money and the members discussed the various issues related to the sorting and scanning processes as well as whether it was more advantageous to fight for Precinct ballot sorting or pursuing the Secretary of State regarding Clear Ballot. Tom Ryan said that since Clear Ballot could solve the problem and do away with the need to do hand counts, he suggested that discussion on purchasing a sorter be delayed until it is ascertained whether or not Clear Ballot will be a viable option. Pat Pecoraro noted, and Brad concurred, that the waiver from the Secretary of State was granted for one Primary and one General Election

ITEM 9. MAXIMUM TRANSPARENCY IN AUDITING – Jim March (Continued Indefinitely)

ITEM 10. GEMS SOFTWARE/PRODUCTION OF ELECTION INFORMATION FOR PARTIES – Tom Ryan/Benny White (Continued to January 18, 2013)

Tom reported that he had received the password from John, had not had a chance to look at the data yet, but will keep moving forward on this issue. Benny inquired if Tom would also be looking at the discrepancy with the larger and smaller Precincts and he responded he would.

ITEM 11. 2012 GENERAL ELECTION COSTS – John Moffatt

John reported that Brad and Chris had been tracking their Election costs throughout the Election. He noted that he had been trying to set up a meeting with F. Ann on the phone issues and costs but scheduling conflicts had created a delay but hoped to set something up for January or February. Benny asked if that document would be public and John responded that it would and felt that it would be educational as well. Benny stated that considering the Commission had received correspondence from the County Administrator requesting this information, it should be public. John felt that this would be an iterative process, and noted that he discussed a standardized method for tracking costs Statewide with the Secretary of State's Office but nothing had come of that conversation.

ITEM 12. SPECIAL SCHEDULING – Arnie Urken (Continued to January 18, 2013)

- Vendor Presentation Status
- Election System Standards Model for Pima County

Arnie was asking when the vendor presentations would begin. Brad responded that there was one scheduled for this meeting, but time constraints prevented that from happening. He advised that Dominion would be the first to present in February. Arnie stated that he

did not want to lose track of the process and that sometime in May or June he hoped that the Commission could have a discussion about everything that they had learned.

John noted that an important component of buying these things is the Pima County Procurement Process. He advised that an RFP needed to be developed, and stated that if the Commission could put the parameters in place, he could provide the structure and stated that the certification process also had to be considered. If this group could develop the parameters (i.e. scanning, central count, etc.) and document those components with a subcommittee, then that will become the nucleus for the RFP that will allow the County to buy what is certified and available. He noted that the purchasing cycle can take 90 to 120 days after the RFP has been processed.

ITEM 13. BEST ELECTION PRACTICES – Mickey Duniho (Continued to January 18, 2013)

- Discussion on Voting – What Has Changed, What Hasn't & What Needs Improvement
- Best Practices List – Review

ITEM 14. STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTING NEW ELECTION INTEGRITY STANDARDS BEFORE THE NEXT GENERAL ELECTION - Barbara Tellman (Continued to January 18, 2013)

Barbara stated that she would like to establish a subcommittee to look specifically at the kinds of changes that could, should or should not occur given the fact that there is a Senate Committee devoted entirely to election issues as well as upcoming changes in the Secretary of State and Governor's Offices. She expressed concern that they will take the opportunity to use the problems in the last Election to sacrifice accuracy and rights to vote for speed in counting ballots.

She thought that there were many upcoming issues that the Commission needed to be aware of and hopefully have the opportunity to provide input; however, the process is moving quickly. She stated that F. Ann has already indicated that she is moving on a lot of her issues. She suggested that a subcommittee should be established.

Benny inquired what happened at the Elections Recap meeting at the Secretary of State's Office on December 6, 2012. Brad stated that at this a meeting, Secretary Bennett addressed the Recorders and Election Officials from the 15 counties in Arizona and that most of them want to go to all mail votes rather than central voting centers. Brad discussed the general topics but stated that it seemed that the Secretary of State was most driven by the media attention that predominantly surrounded Maricopa County and the number of ballots that they had, as well as criticism from the media about the way that the issues were handled. The Members discussed other issues including replacement of equipment costs, revamping of antiquated procedures, etc. Brad stated that he felt that at the moment the Secretary of State appears to be in an "information gathering" mode. John said that he came away with the feeling that the majority of the County Election Officials and Recorders felt, that in spite of some of the Election problems, the process was pretty much business as usual.

It was moved by Barbara Tellman, seconded by Mickey Duniho and unanimously carried that a subcommittee be established to look at possible changes in the laws at State level and the Attorney General's Office and that this committee look at other issues, but in the near term, concentrate on the Legislature because they are moving very quickly. Barbara Tellman, Benny White and Tom Ryan agreed to serve on the subcommittee.

ITEM 15. NEXT MEETING DATE AND TIME

The next meeting date was set for Friday, January 18, 2013, Board of Supervisors 1st Floor Conference Room.

ITEM 16. NEW BUSINESS

No new business was brought to the table.

ITEM 17. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

The Chairman inquired if anyone wished to be heard. No one appeared.

ITEM 18. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.