



**PIMA COUNTY ELECTION INTEGRITY COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES FOR AUGUST 15, 2014**
<http://www.pima.gov/commission/ElectionIntegrity.shtml>

The Pima County Election Integrity Commission met in regular session on August 15, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. in the Herbert K. Abrams Building, 1st Floor Conference Room #1104 at 3950 S. Country Club Road, Tucson, Arizona.

ITEM 1. ROLL CALL

Present: Elaine Lim, Pat Pecoraro, Bill Beard, Chris Cole, Arnie Urken, Brad Nelson, Tom Ryan (via teleconference), Barbara Tellman.

Others in Attendance: Ellen Wheeler, County Administrator's Office

Absent: Mickey Duniho, Benny White, Matt Smith

ITEM 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The American flag was saluted with the Pledge of Allegiance.

ITEM 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTE SUMMARY – July 11, 2014

It was moved by Pat Pecoraro, seconded by Bill Beard and carried unanimously to approve the Summary of the July 11, 2014 meeting.

ITEM 4. REMOVAL OF COMMISSION MEMBER FOR NON-ATTENDANCE

Pat Pecoraro moved that this Item be moved for discussion after Item 10, to allow Matt Smith the opportunity to appear; Bill Beard seconded the motion; the motion was carried unanimously to move Item 4 for discussion after Item 10.

ITEM 5. OPEN MEETING LAW COMPLAINT RESPONSE AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION – Barbara Tellman

Bill Beard was contacted by Barbara Tellman because the County Attorney's office felt that a more politically balanced representation was needed on the subcommittee for interviewing potential attorneys for representation. However, the tone of later communication from the County Attorney indicated to Bill that they needed to "sit down, shut up and do what we tell you to do." He felt this was insulting to him as a Commission member. Chris Cole asked if anyone had investigated the possibility of choosing an attorney through the Arizona State Bar Association; the response was no.

Barbara Tellman reiterated that the County Administrator has agreed to expend funds to retain an attorney through the settlement phase if the complaint goes to court, and that all three of the attorneys suggested by the County Attorney's office had agreed to provide services at a discount. She interprets this provision as that if the Commission chooses an attorney other than one of these three, the County will not cover the cost. The County is not required to provide any funding, but is doing so under this provision. If individuals later need representation, that will be at their own expense.

Barbara referred to the list of the three attorneys [a copy of this list is incorporated into these minutes as Attachment 1]. She found more information on all three attorneys on the internet. She read a statement that was composed by the subcommittee of Barbara, Mickey Duniho and Bill Beard:

Past experience indicates that these open meeting violations are generally handled by negotiation without actually going to court and that the result (except in egregious cases) is for a reprimand and order for additional training. Mr. Huckelberry indicated in his complaint that we have been given plenty of training in open meeting law, but we have not had an offer of training before the most recent one that came after the event in question. This may have some weight in a negotiation.

We looked at the resumes and Internet sites for the three lawyers. From what we could learn, all three have had some experience with open meeting law cases, but none has extensive experience, probably because open meeting law cases are relatively rare.

Any of the three lawyers would probably do a creditable job. We rejected Thomas Benavidez because although he has the most experience in this area, he has a long-standing connection with Pima County, including the RTA cases. Donna Aversa appears to be the most experienced of the remaining two in dealing with boards and commissions and conflict resolution. Paul Loucks also appears to have relevant experience.

We recommend Ms. Aversa, largely because it is our hope that the matter can be settled out of court through negotiation.

Bill Beard pointed out that, through previous discussion within the Commission, the decision to interview the attorneys was discouraged by the County Attorney's office. Barbara also added that the Commission was discouraged from expecting that the attorneys view the video to familiarize themselves with the case. Tom Ryan said that the argument is that it shouldn't be expected that the attorneys would spend their own time without being paid to review the video or the audio until they have actually been chosen to represent the Commission and are being paid.

Bill Beard said that as a subcommittee member, he is happy to recommend one of the three attorneys, but as a Commission member, he will be voting against pursuing this matter, because in principle, he does not believe he did anything wrong, nor does he believe that the Commission as a whole violated any law [during the May 9, 2014 meeting during the Call to the Public]. Chris Cole agreed; he doesn't see that anything that was said in the May meeting could incur any possible violation, and he sees a conflict of interest in the County Attorney's office recommending these three attorneys, since County government is pursuing this action against the Commission. Barbara asked Bill Beard what he expects would happen, since a complaint has been made, if the Commission does nothing and doesn't answer; Bill responded that, as is typical in a bureaucracy, the complaint will sit on someone's desk until it's dealt with. A non-response would be a response, and if they want to take further action later, deal with it then. Again, in principle, Bill doesn't see that the Commission did anything wrong, and that the Attorney General sent a *pro forma* response to a complaint filed with them, asking for the Commission's response to the violation.

MOTION & VOTE

Pat stated that he would like to convert the subcommittee's recommendation to a motion. His motion is to recommend Ms. Aversa, largely because it is our hope that the matter can be settled out of court, through negotiation; Chris Cole seconded the motion. A vote was taken on the motion; Arnie Urken, Chris Cole, Barbara Tellman, Tom Ryan, Pat Pecoraro, and Elaine Lim voted in favor of the motion; Bill Beard voted against the motion. The motion passed 6 to 1.

The next step in this process is to contact the County Attorney's office so that a contract can be drawn up with Ms. Aversa. Tom Ryan said he would contact the County Attorney's office.

ITEM 6. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION LETTERS – Barbara Tellman

- **Recommendation to Not Proceed with Procurement of New Election System Equipment Unless Precinct Scanners are Included.**
- **Recommendation for Early Ballot Sorting by Precinct for Primary Election as Feasibility Experiment.**

[A copy of each recommendation letter is incorporated into these minutes as Attachment 2.]

Bill Beard noted that both recommendations were voted down by the Board of Supervisors 4 to 1. He echoed what he has heard from other members: What's the point of this Commission as an advisory body if the Board of Supervisors "thumbs their noses" at everything the Commission recommends? Each one of the Commission members spends a lot of their own time digging into the details, and the recommendations are not made lightly.

Barbara asked what Bill's conclusion would be, and his recommendation if he felt the Commission was not fulfilling its purpose. Bill didn't necessarily have a recommendation.

Tom commented that he wasn't surprised by the outcome of the vote; the recommendation for the early ballot sorting was risky what with the chain of custody. He suggested an experiment for just finding ballots and not removing them from their storage boxes, and not even a full search. All that is necessary is an estimate of how long the process might take. If that experiment shows that it would take a great deal of time, then perhaps the Commission is on the wrong track. However, if Mickey's estimates are closer, then a more extensive experiment could be tried.

Barbara added that going through the boxes multiple times to ensure that all ballots have been found would also be a good idea.

There was further discussion about ensuring that there are no legal prohibitions against such an experiment, and any extra handling of the ballots. Bill's understanding of the details of election administration as given in the Secretary of State's Procedure Manual sets a floor standard, not a ceiling for handling of ballots, and one should not go below that standard. Exceeding those standards may be permissible as long as that next step doesn't violate some other provision. Those next steps would need to be thought out, and any potential hazards identified.

Tom Ryan mentioned that on their own, Pima County made a decision to increase the number of precincts for the hand-count audit from the prescribed two percent of precincts in the Procedures Manual. Brad Nelson concurred, stating that during a Board of Supervisors' meeting, there was a request from some within the audience to increase the number of precinct cast ballots for audit. The

County Attorney's office advised the Board that the prescribed two percent was a floor, but if they wanted to do more they could. The Board of Supervisors decided to go with four percent of the precincts of ballots cast at the polls. There was a similar request to increase the number of early ballots. The County Attorney then advised the Board that there was not the leeway within the early ballot process.

It was agreed that Bill Beard, Mickey Duniho and Tom Ryan would work together to develop an outline of steps in order to pursue the legality of another proposed experiment. They will report back at the next meeting.

ITEM 7. ELECTION SYSTEM PROCUREMENT

- **Updates/New Information – Brad Nelson**

Contract negotiations are going forward; tentatively, the item is set for Board of Supervisor action on September 2, 2014 for award of contract. Again, that is tentatively, as Procurement and ITD are looking over the contracts. Bill asked Brad what Yavapai and Pinal Counties have decided on purchase of new election equipment. Brad read in a Prescott newspaper that Yavapai County has decided to lease their equipment for a four-year period. To Brad's knowledge, Pinal County's was a purchase. They are currently going through the Logic and Accuracy testing, so the equipment is up and running. (Brad reported later in the meeting that Pinal County confirmed that they had purchased all the equipment.

ITEM 8. COST OF ELECTIONS

- **Determine the feasibility of the Elections Department or Recorder's office to monitor and report election costs on Elections Cost Spreadsheet - Mickey Duniho**

This item is tabled until Mickey is present at the next meeting.

- **Use of cost data – Tom Ryan**

Tom asked who is currently keeping records in the Elections Department and Recorder's office. Brad responded that in the Elections Department Gloria Abarca has detailed information for past elections. This information could presumably be forecast for future elections. The Recorder's office should also be included in this discussion.

MOTION

Bill Beard made a motion to request the Recorder's office to identify an individual in that office to serve as a liaison to work with the Elections Department personnel for determining and standardizing the reporting of election costs in a timely manner. Chris Cole seconded the motion.

Bill recalled that in the July 11th meeting, Mickey Duniho had come up with four questions on his "Pima County Election Cost Analysis Based on Data from 2012 Elections." [A copy of this analysis is incorporated into these minutes as Attachment 3; during the motion on July 11th to provide this information to the Elections Department and Recorder's office, a fifth question was added.] This is a good starting point.

VOTE

A vote was called on the motion; the motion was passed unanimously.

ITEM 9. INVITATION TO COMMISSION MEMBERS TO OBSERVE BALLOT TABULATION – Brad Nelson

- **August 26, 2014 Primary Election Events Calendar**

Brad extended the invitation for anyone, not just Commission members to come observe ballot tabulation; the Department also streams online. Also, anyone who wants may come observe preparation of ballots or Logic and Accuracy testing. The "August 26, 2014 Primary Election Events Calendar" was provided [a copy of the calendar is incorporated into these minutes as Attachment 3].

Bill asked Brad if while preparing the equipment for this coming election cycle, any problems were encountered relating to the reliability of the equipment. Brad responded that, despite careful packing and storage of the equipment after the 2012 elections, as those scanners have been prepared for the coming election cycle, a variety of problems have come up. Prior to putting any election parameters on the equipment, diagnostics and performance testing are run to make sure everything works internally within the system. Some of the scanners were dying in this phase. As this equipment is being prepared, Department personnel are finding about a 10% error rate. Brad is preparing a letter to Mr. Huckelberry, the Election Integrity Commission and Secretary of State that when, not if, but when scanners fail at polling locations for whatever reason, poll workers know what to do, because voting does not stop. When voters cast their ballot, they then put it in the emergency bin on the side of the scanner. No one is turned away or asked to come back later. If those ballots aren't able to be scanned at the polling place they will be brought back to the Elections Department under lock and key by two individuals of opposing political parties. The scanning equipment used in Central Count is the same as is used in precincts, but with a different chip in it. The Central Count equipment does not seem to have any problems. The political party representatives are running their test ballots today [Friday, August 15, 2014], and the Secretary of State's Office representatives will be coming [Monday, August 18, 2014] to perform the Logic and Accuracy Test. In all of those tests, all of the Central Count scanners are used; so far, there haven't been any problems. They have had maintenance and replacement of belts and traction wheels.

ITEM 10. FUTURE ELECTION SYSTEM DESIGN – Arnie Urken

Arnie Urken stated that this item is based on some past discussion about having some sort of relationship with the University of Arizona to bring people together from various fields, including law and technology, to look at the future of election systems. The goal is to have an effect on what the various vendors provide to the County as alternatives. The University has a five-year plan to improve what they call "informatics." Arnie's hope is that a recommendation from the Commission to the Board of Supervisors will result in a request from Chuck Huckelberry to the University to convene a series of sessions to investigate the socio-technical issues regarding future election issues. This could involve bringing participants in from outside of Tucson who have expertise in this area, including representatives from our current vendor and other vendors. Arnie plans to draft a letter for the Commission to eventually be sent from Mr. Huckelberry. He would like to hear suggestions or concerns that the members of the Commission might have; if the Commission feels that it isn't a good idea, Arnie would like to know that, also.

Tom agreed that, as a general concept, it would be beneficial to be familiar with what may be coming in the future of election systems; his question is how would this actually be implemented, and could we find people who have the expertise about the future of elections? Pat Pecoraro asked if past

presentations hadn't already addressed this, such as the presentation by Larry Moore. Tom agreed that that was the most advanced system seen so far, but perhaps there would be other systems more forward-thinking than that in the future. Bill Beard noted that, while technology has been leap-frogging in advancements, the law hasn't necessarily kept up and may not allow for such rapid growth in technology. Unless representation from the Legislature was included in these conversations, this may not be feasible.

Barbara Tellman questioned the timeliness of this, given the County's impending procurement of a new Central Count system, and it may be another five to ten years before there would be a need to look at another system. Arnie responded that if you wait until time to do a new RFP, you are too late. The idea of thinking about it now for the future averts having to accept something undesirable as a *fait accompli*. Included in these discussions should be Secretary of State's office personnel and Legislators who can offer input on how a new system would fit in with Arizona's laws. Arnie will draft a letter from the Commission to the Board of Supervisors to be sent by Mr. Huckelberry. Arnie believes the University is interested in doing such things, and may see it as an opportunity to receive grant funding for establishing a new area of expertise.

ITEM 4. REMOVAL OF COMMISSION MEMBER FOR NON-ATTENDANCE

Matt Smith, Green Party representative to the Election Integrity Commission, was appointed on March 4, 2014. His only attendance was at the meeting on May 9, 2014. Brad sent a letter via U.S. mail to Mr. Smith and the Green Party Chair that based on the EIC By-Laws for attendance—missing four consecutive meetings or 40% of meetings—he was terminated. Mr. Smith left a voice message after receiving the letter saying the removal was unwarranted because he had not, at that time, missed four meetings in a row. Since he did not leave a telephone number with his voice message, further communication was done by e-mail, in which his attendance record and an invitation to attend the next meeting was sent to him. He was invited to address the Commission; perhaps the attendance records were incorrect, or application of the By-Laws was wrong. There was no further communication by Mr. Smith to Brad in response to the e-mails.

Arnie thought that Mr. Smith should be notified in writing that a vote will be taken at the next meeting on his removal. Elaine Lim concurred. Chris Cole suggested sending a formal letter to Mr. Smith and to the Chair of the Green Party notifying them that because of his non-attendance, his removal will be on the Agenda for the next meeting. Bill Beard read the relevant citation in the By-Laws [Article IV, Section 6] that states that a member "who fails to attend four (4) consecutive regularly scheduled meetings and/or who fails to attend at least forty percent (40%) of the meetings called in a calendar year will be terminated." The provision for recommendation for removal of an EIC member for reasonable cause may not necessarily apply in this case. It would appear that Mr. Smith's removal is administrative according to the failure to attend 40% of meetings provision. But if Mr. Smith wishes to be reappointed, which the Green Party Chair could certainly do, he can go through the appointment process through the Board of Supervisors again.

MOTION & VOTE

Bill Beard made a motion to send a letter to the Green Party that the Commission will vote for his removal at the next meeting unless he attends the meeting and provides cause, with the caveat that his participation in the meetings can be done telephonically; the Green Party will also be requested to appoint a new Commission member. Chris Cole seconded the motion; the motion was carried unanimously. Brad will draft the letter.

ITEM 11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

An Executive Session will be scheduled at the next meeting to meet with Donna Aversa for legal advice on the Attorney General's complaint.

ITEM 12. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting date was set for Tuesday, September 9, 2014.

ITEM 13. CALL TO PUBLIC

None present.

ITEM 14. ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Bill Beard and seconded by Pat Pecoraro and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 10:38 a.m.

ATTACHMENT 1

THOMAS BENAVIDEZ

Thomas Benavidez is the owner of Benavidez Law Group, P.C. He provides legal counsel for several local government entities, including: Northwest Fire District, Drexel Heights Fire District, Mount Lemmon Fire District, the Regional Transportation Authority of Pima County ["RTA"], Pima Association of Governments ["PAG"] and Huachuca City. Thomas has advised and provided training to employees of municipal clients on almost all legal issues facing them, including initial and periodic follow-up training on Arizona's Open Meeting Law, Public Records Law, and Conflict of Interest Law, including live presentations and written materials. Thomas also trains newly-elected officials on the important aspects of these laws.

Thomas has been practicing law for nearly 18 years, and to date, his legal career has been dedicated almost exclusively to local government legal issues, including annexations, condemnations, employment matters, voting and elections, compliance with open meeting laws, public records requests, rights and responsibilities of public employees and officers, labor/management meet and confer processes, municipal budget issues, all forms of contract and personal injury litigation, intergovernmental agreements, municipal procurement processes, and attendance at public meetings. Thomas also serves as a Judge Pro Tempore for the Pima County Consolidated Justice Court. He has held this position for the past 11 years.

DONNA AVERSA

Donna Aversa is a partner in the Tucson based law firm Leonard & Felker, P.L.C., where she has practiced law for 27 years. She is a product of the University of Arizona where she earned both her undergraduate and law degrees.

Donna helps private and public sector clients, including Boards and Commissions, solve problems, avoid conflicts and resolve disputes by advising them regarding alternatives and best practices. When necessary, she represents her clients at administrative hearings, Superior Court and Arizona Court of Appeals.

In Arizona, she is a regular presenter at the Arizona Fire District Association on governance issues and open meeting laws and at the Pinal County Special District Meeting on Open Meeting Laws. Nationally, she has presented at the International Association of Women in Fire & Emergency Services and the International Association of Fire Chiefs' Fire Rescue International Conferences on employment, leadership and work-place culture issues.

PAUL LOUCKS

Paul A. Loucks joined Mesch Clark & Rothschild in 2006, and is a Partner practicing principally in the firm's Construction and Business Sections. In addition to being licensed to practice in all Arizona courts, he is also licensed to practice before the United States

Patent and Trademark Office. Paul received his BS in Physics from the University of Nevada in 1993. He subsequently worked for Lockheed Analytical Systems as an Analytical Chemist in Nevada and as a Chemist at Skyline Labs in Tucson, Arizona.

Paul graduated from the University of Arizona School of Law in 1999. Prior to joining Mesch, Clark & Rothschild, he worked in the public sector as a Law Clerk for the Arizona Court of Appeals, Division Two, and as a Deputy Pima County Attorney. He has worked in variety of legal areas including corporate, contracts, construction, land use, tort, employment, domestic relations, criminal and intellectual property.

Paul's public-sector practice has included representing various entities and municipalities throughout Southern Arizona in a variety of issues, including open meetings law, procurement, zoning, and construction litigation. During his tenure with the Pima County Attorney's office, Paul was nominated by the Metropolitan Pima Alliance for a 2006 Common Ground Award in Public Projects as part of the team which developed the Corona de Tucson Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion Plan.

Paul sits on the Board of Directors of the El Rio Health Center Foundation, which supports the El Rio Community Health Center. He has served on the Boards of other non-profit organizations, including Handi-Dogs, Inc., and has worked with neglected families and foster children for many years.

ATTACHMENT 2

ELECTION INTEGRITY COMMISSION

PIMA COUNTY  ARIZONA



TO: Honorable Chair and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

FROM: Barbara Tellman, Co-Chair
Election Integrity Commission

DATE: July 18, 2014

RE: Recommendation to Not Proceed at this time with Procurement of
New Election System Equipment unless Precinct Scanners are included.

The Procurement Department of the Pima County Government issued an RFP for purchase of new election equipment. Evaluation has been done by a procurement committee, including two members of the Election Integrity Commission. A recommendation will come to the Board of Supervisors soon.

By majority vote (5-2), the Election Integrity Commission recommends that the Pima County Board of Supervisors not proceed with the purchase of the ES&S EVS central count system as currently proposed without the inclusion of precinct scanners. The majority believes that precinct scanners must remain an integral part of elections and that the decision to purchase new equipment should include both.

Sincerely,

Barbara Tellman, Election Integrity Commission Co-chair

ELECTION INTEGRITY COMMISSION

PIMA COUNTY  ARIZONA



TO: Honorable Chair and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

FROM: Barbara Tellman, Co-Chair
Election Integrity Commission

DATE: July 18, 2014

RE: Recommendation for Early Ballot Sorting by Precinct for
August 26, 2014 Primary Election as a Feasibility Experiment

Pima County conducts hand count audits of a prescribed number of randomly chosen ballots after Election Day. Both early ballots and precinct-cast ballots are hand counted but the early ballot audit has a significant shortcoming. This is easiest to understand if we think of the early ballot counting as consisting of three steps:

- 1) scanning of mixed-precinct ballot batches
- 2) sorting and accumulation of batch tallies in election management software
- 3) reporting results

Currently, the early ballot audit checks only step 1, which ensures that the central count scanners are working correctly. But this audit completely ignores steps 2 and 3 and would completely miss any error due to fraud or software bugs that might occur in such data handling. Both of these steps are dependent on the integrity of the election database, which is arguably the most vulnerable part of the system. The hand count audit of the precinct-cast ballots, on the other hand, has a chance of catching errors in all parts of the system.

The majority of the Commission feels that this discrepancy in the integrity of the audit should be fixed and that early ballots should be audited by precinct and counted in the same manner as precinct-cast ballots. Therefore, the Pima County Election Integrity Commission, by a 5-4 vote, requests that the Pima County Board of Supervisors direct the Elections Department to conduct a pilot study during the August 26, 2014 Primary. In this pilot study, early ballots would be scanned as usual. Only ballots scanned prior to 7:00 p.m. on Election Day would be involved. After scanning and after the random selection of precincts for audit, ballots associated with two audit precincts would be found and removed from boxes. These ballots would be hand counted as part of the post-election hand count, and the count compared with the machine count for those precincts as registered by 7:00 p.m. on Election Day.

This pilot study will determine how long it takes to find the required early ballots. The efficiency of the process, as well as maintaining the integrity of the ballots and adherence to Arizona law through the process will be the main factors in determining the feasibility and desirability of sorting early ballots for audit in future elections.

Sincerely,

Barbara Tellman
Co-Chair, Election Integrity Committee

ATTACHMENT 3

Pima County Election Cost Analysis Based on Data from 2012 Elections

Date of Election	28-Feb Pres Pref Primary	17-Apr CD-8 Primary	12-Jun CD-8 General	28-Aug Primary	6-Nov General	Totals	Averages
Total Cost to Pima County	\$ 716,146	\$ 866,184	\$ 948,442	\$ 1,562,669	\$ 1,703,758	\$ 5,797,199	\$ 1,159,440
Ballots	77,314	101,798	179,019	161,652	385,725	905,508	181,102
Pima County Cost per Ballot	\$ 9.26	\$ 8.51	\$ 5.30	\$ 9.67	\$ 4.42	\$ 6.40	\$ 6.40
Total Cost of Election Before Reimbursement							
Reimbursement	\$ 1,012,315	\$ 1,264,577	\$ 1,346,834	\$ 1,670,097	\$ 2,432,307	\$ 7,726,130	\$ 1,545,226
Pre-Reimbursement Cost per Ballot	\$ 13.09	\$ 12.42	\$ 7.52	\$ 10.33	\$ 6.31	\$ 8.53	\$ 8.53
Projected 2014 Costs (Primary, General)				\$ 1,562,669	\$ 1,703,758	\$ 3,266,427	\$ 1,633,214
Ballots				161,652	385,725	547,377	273,689
Projected 2014 Cost per Ballot				\$ 9.67	\$ 4.42	\$ 5.97	\$ 5.97
Fixed Election Department Costs 2012/2013						\$ 977,028	
Fixed Costs per 2012 Ballot						\$ 1.08	
2012 Primaries were more expensive (per ballot) than General Elections:							
Primary Cost per Ballot	\$ 9.26	\$ 8.51		\$ 9.67			\$ 9.15
General Cost per Ballot			\$ 5.30		\$ 4.42		\$ 4.86
Elections are a very small part of the Pima County Budget:							
Pima County Budget 2012/2013						\$ 1,344,186,955	100.00%
2012 Election Cost Before Reimbursement						\$ 7,726,130	0.57%
2012 Election Cost to Pima County (after reimbursement)						\$ 5,797,199	0.43%
Projected 2014 Cost to Pima County (Primary, General)						\$ 3,266,427	0.24%
Projected 2016 Cost to Pima County (Pres Pref Primary, Primary, General)						\$ 3,982,573	0.30%

Questions:

1. What are the cost savings (per ballot and percent of budget) from removing scanners from polling places?
2. What would be the increased cost (per ballot and percent of budget) to sort early ballots by precinct and do statistically valid hand-count audits?
3. What would be the increased cost of elections with a two-page ballot, or with bifurcated ballots?
4. What would be the cost savings (per ballot and percent of budget) from all-mail elections?

NOTE: A fifth question was added:

5. Since much of the per-ballot cost is driven by Arizona's Open Primary system, what would be the cost savings (per ballot and percent of budget) of a closed primary system versus an open primary system?

ATTACHMENT 4

August 26, 2014
Primary Election
Events Calendar

Event	Date	Time	Location	Explanation
County Inhouse Touchscreen, Accu-Vote and Central Count Logic and Accuracy Test Begins	Begins 7/14	12:00 PM	6550 S. Country Club Road	Pima County Elections tests the Accu-Votes, Central Count and Touchscreens.
Official Accessible Voting Equipment (Touchscreen) Logic and Accuracy Test	7/30	8:00 AM	6550 S. Country Club Road	Prior to the start of early voting, a Logic and Accuracy Test must be done on the Touchscreens that will be used during early voting and at the Polls. Early voting begins on July 31.
Early Ballots Received from the Recorder's Office	8/8 (?)	PM	6550 S. Country Club Road	
Early Ballot Processing begins	8/11 (?)	8:00 AM	6550 S. Country Club Road	The Early Ballots are processed, taken out of the envelopes, flattened and sent to the Elections Tech Center for counting. This process will continue every day until the last Early Ballot has been sent to the Elections Tech Center for counting.
Political Party Logic and Accuracy Test Ballot Marking Begins	8/11 - 8/15	8:30 AM - 4:00 PM	6550 S. Country Club Road	An appointed member of each Political Party has an opportunity to mark a test deck of ballots to further ensure the accuracy of the Election Equipment and Program.
Political Party Logic and Accuracy Test	8/15	1:00 PM	6550 S. Country Club Road	Appointed members of each Political Party test the Accu-Votes, Central Count and Touchscreens.
Official Accu-Vote and Central Count Logic and Accuracy Test	8/18	10:30 AM	6550 S. Country Club Road	Prior to election day, the Accu-Votes being used at every polling place and the central counting system (how Early Ballots are counted) must be tested to ensure the equipment is reading each ballot correctly.
Poll Worker Class Schedule	Online	Online	6550 S. Country Club Road	Prior to each election, all poll workers must attend a training class.
Counting of Early Ballots begins	Beginning 8/20	8:00 AM	6550 S. Country Club Road	The Early Ballots are sent through the central count system, but no results are released until election night after 8:00 PM.
Counting of Early Ballots continued	8/21	8:00 AM	6550 S. Country Club Road	The Early Ballots will be counted each day as quantities warrant it.
Counting of Early Ballots continued	8/22	8:00 AM	6550 S. Country Club Road	The Early Ballots will be counted each day as quantities warrant it.
Counting of Early Ballots continued	8/25	2:00 PM	6550 S. Country Club Road	The Early Ballots will be counted each day as quantities warrant it.
Counting of Early Ballots continued	8/26	5:00 PM	6550 S. Country Club Road	The Early Ballots will be counted each day as quantities warrant it.
Upload of Accu-Vote Optical Scan Voting Devices	8/26	7:30 PM	6550 S. Country Club Road	Upload count of the Accu-Vote Optical Scan Voting Devices as soon as they come in from Satellite Receiving Stations.
Upload of Touchscreen Units	8/27	10:00 AM	6550 S. Country Club Road	Upload count of the TSX units from the polls and Voter Reg.
Hand Count Audit Meeting	8/27	3:00 PM	6550 S. Country Club Road	State Law requires the hand count audit process begin 24 hours after the election. At this time, we will discuss when and where the Voting Areas will be chosen to be hand count audited.

August 26, 2014
Primary Election
Events Calendar

Event	Date	Time	Location	Explanation
Begin processing Provisional Ballots	8/28	AM	6550 S. Country Club Road	Provisional Ballots are ballots marked by voters who must be verified by the Recorder's Office for a variety of reasons.
Process Provisional Ballots	8/29	8:00 AM	6550 S. Country Club Road	Provisional Ballots will be processed as quantities warrant it.
Counting of Early Ballots continued	8/29	2:00 PM	6550 S. Country Club Road	The Early Ballots will be counted each day as quantities warrant it.
Last day a voter who used a Conditional Envelope can show ID	8/29	5:00 PM		
Hand Count Audit Offices and Races chosen	8/30	8:00 AM	6550 S. Country Club Road	
Hand Count Audit Party Members arrive	8/30	8:30 AM - 9:00 AM	Abrams Building at 3950 S. Country Club Rd.	Party Members arrive to sign in and prepare for instruction.
Hand Count Audit	8/30	9:00 AM	Abrams Building at 3950 S. Country Club Rd.	A Hand Count of previously and randomly picked offices and precincts is conducted by members of the political parties.
Counting of the Provisional and Conditional Ballots	8/30	Immediately following the Hand Count Audit	6550 S. Country Club Road	The Provisional Ballots verified by the Recorder's Office are counted.
Process Write-In Ballots	8/30	Immediately following the Hand Count Audit	6550 S. Country Club Road	Write-In Votes for Official Write-In Candidates are tallied and counted.
Official Post Logic and Accuracy Test	8/30	Immediately following the final ballot count	6550 S. Country Club Road	After each election a post Logic and Accuracy Test is required to ensure the programming system has not been altered and is still reading the ballots correctly. The post Logic and Accuracy Test will be performed after the hand count audit is complete.
Canvass of Election	9/2 (?)		130 W. Congress St.	The Board of Supervisors must canvass the election.

The only dates on this events calendar that are a certainty are the Logic and Accuracy Test dates. All others are subject to change.