



PIMA COUNTY ELECTION INTEGRITY COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES FOR October 17, 2014
<http://www.pima.gov/commission/ElectionIntegrity.shtml>

The Pima County Election Integrity Commission met in regular session on October 17, 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

Tom Ryan first welcomed new Election Integrity Commission member, Beth Borozan who was appointed by Supervisor Ray Carroll to replace Mickey Duniho. He also welcomed Matt Smith, reappointed as the Green Party representative.

Present: Tom Ryan, Barbara Tellman, Chris Cole, Arnie Urken, Matt Smith, Brad Nelson, Benny White, Beth Borozan, Elaine Lim, Bill Beard, and Pat Pecoraro.

Others in Attendance: Ellen Wheeler, County Administrator's Office; Chris Roads, Pima County Recorder's Office

ITEM 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The American flag was saluted with the Pledge of Allegiance.

ITEM 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTE SUMMARY – September 9, 2014

It was moved by Chris Cole, seconded by Bill Beard and carried unanimously to approve the Minutes of the September 9, 2014 meeting.

ITEM 4. OPEN MEETING LAW ISSUES & TRAINING – Tom Ryan

Tom Ryan said he wanted to put this on the agenda to close the issue of the Attorney General Open Meeting Laws violation complaint and response, and to keep training on the Laws fresh. Tom would like to see the training occur on a yearly basis. Benny White asked Matt Smith and Beth Borozan if they had been given any training or information when they were administered the Loyalty Oath; Beth responded that she had gone online to review the Law. The letter that she received with the Oath stated that these materials should be reviewed at least one day before the meeting. Matt wasn't sure what it meant. Tom explained that, to indicate the importance of the issue, in the last few months, the Commission has had problems in this area, especially the Call to the Public and the Commission's ability to respond to anything said during those sessions. The agenda has to be followed very carefully; it is incumbent upon everyone to ensure they understand the Law. A copy of the Law is in the minutes for the September 9, 2014 meeting, which was distributed to everyone. A paper copy was then provided to Matt since he does not have the capability to download and print.

It was decided that an Open Meeting Law briefing would be scheduled for the next couple of months.

ITEM 5. PUBLICITY PAMPHLETS: COSTS, REIMBURSEMENTS, TIMING – Bill Beard

Bill Beard said that a number of people had questioned who determines what goes into a publicity pamphlet and were concerned that in the County's pamphlet, only information on Prop 415 was in that pamphlet. About a week later, school district pamphlets started arriving. Bill asked who puts these together, who determines what goes in where, and why different pamphlets were mailed out at different times.

Brad responded that he didn't presume to answer to all the publicity pamphlets, but he could give some information on the Prop 415 pamphlet. Currently in Pima County there is a publicity pamphlet for the statewide issues, issued by the Arizona Secretary of State; there is the countywide issue, which is Prop 415; then there are school district publicity pamphlets. The Tucson Unified School District's pamphlet concerns proposed permission for property sale; most of the other school districts are concerned with a vote to extend their override capability. For all schools in Pima County, the responsibility for putting out publicity pamphlets is the County School Superintendent. For issues put before voters by the Pima County Board of Supervisors, the responsibility to publish a pamphlet is predominantly the Elections Department with input from bond attorneys, the County Attorney's office, and the Recorder's office. The timing for the countywide pamphlet is governed by A.R.S. §35-454, which says that the publicity pamphlet must be mailed to every household with a registered voter in the jurisdiction not less than 35 days before the bond election. Bill asked who was responsible for publicizing information on the publicity pamphlet, and who determines the solicitation for "yes" and "no" arguments? Brad stated that the Board of Supervisors must hold various public meetings pertaining to the bond issue; there may be bond counsel meetings, etc. Once the Board of Supervisors calls for the election, there is a requirement to, at the same time, publish a notice soliciting arguments in favor or against the bond issue. For the bond election, the notice was published in both the *Arizona Daily Star* and the *Territorial*. State statute requires the solicitation of pro and con statements.

Pat Pecoraro mentioned that the sample ballot he received had proposition descriptions for all over Pima County, and wondered why that was. Brad explained that the sample ballots have always been done that way. A sample of the actual ballot is shown, but also the full text for all propositions in the county. A proposition that does not affect a particular precinct does not appear on the sample of the actual ballot. But the sample ballots are designed this way to save a lot of money, by not making them specific to each precinct. The proposition descriptions are somewhat of a shell that then the specific ballot is laid into. At the polling place, that same sample ballot information will be attached to the sides of the privacy curtains on the polling booth.

Chris Cole asked about the feasibility of combining all propositions for the various jurisdictions into one pamphlet. Brad responded that he didn't know how workable that would actually be since so many different jurisdictions would need to be involved, with multiple deadline dates to get them published.

ITEM 6. PLANS FOR NOVEMBER ELECTION – Barbara Tellman

- **Changes to Pilot Project? – Brad Nelson**

Barbara asked this item to be put on the agenda for Brad to discuss what if any changes would be made to the pilot project, and for Chris Roads to discuss the e-poll books. These two items could actually be combined.

Brad reiterated a point he had made in the previous meeting that there had been some confusion among poll workers with data in the e-poll books. Some of the data that they are used to seeing in the printed rosters did not appear in the e-poll books. For example, middle names did not appear in the e-poll books, which made it more difficult to identify some individuals. Suffixes for male names were missing—Sr., Jr., etc. Mailing addresses were also missing; this is critical because sometimes the P.O. Box is displayed on the ID. These deficiencies have been corrected for the General Election.

Brad also noted that in the four precincts in Green Valley that used the electronic poll books in the Primary Election, the poll books will be removed because those precincts are going to go through enough changes because of a miscue on the Continental School District race on the ballot. He will be discussing the ballot problem during Item 8 of the agenda.

Barbara Tellman asked Chris Roads to give his evaluation of the e-poll books used during the Primary. Chris stated that they encountered issues with the vendor who was providing the service during the pilot project. The Recorder's office did provide the missing data, but the vendor did not upload all those records into the poll books. Another issue during the pilot was independent voters who chose a party's ballot and poll workers were required to capture that information. There was a feature on the e-poll book that could be bypassed by the poll workers. In two precincts, the feature was bypassed a total of eight times, so those eight party choices were lost. The vendor had been specifically informed that data must be captured, but the vendor did not program that feature in. Although the e-poll books have been overwhelmingly accepted, there were a few instances when the voter refused to sign electronically on the poll book, and instead signed on the paper roster.

Overall, Chris found the vendor Knowlnk unresponsive to them and their requests, although the e-poll books themselves performed fairly well with a few "hiccups." However, there is a big hole in the security of the poll books. The Recorder's office had believed that they would be uploading voter data directly to the vendor, who would then download it to the books. However, the vendor was loading it to a "cloud" server, manipulating the data while in the cloud, and then downloading onto the poll books. That is unacceptable to the Recorder's office. They had requested the vendor provide an application to the Recorder's office so they could download the information to the poll books; this was the pricing that the Recorder's office had requested, which the vendor has not given them. Bill Beard asked if the vendor still has the data given them in the cloud; Chris did not know the answer to that, which is the problem with this entire process. He cited an example with the statewide voter registration database where issues with the database left 13 counties, aside from Pima and Maricopa with no ability to enter voter information while the vendor for the State tried to figure out how to fix the problem. That is the Recorder's office fear in dealing with a vendor who is in control of their operations.

Chris Cole asked if the vendor still has the voter data, and could, if they wanted, to sell it to a commercial interest. Chris Roads said that the vendor has 25 precincts of data that is now 60 days stale. They have a contractual obligation that they will not sell or distribute the data, and to remove it from their cloud when they are done. However, there is no provision for the Recorder's office to look in their database to ensure that was done. Because of the discomfort the Recorder's office felt, only data from the 25 precincts was provided, and only precinct-specific data was put on each set of poll books.

Barbara inquired if there were any other vendors who might have been able to provide this service better. Chris Roads responded he has not looked at all the vendors; what they looked at was how much it would cost to use a commercial product versus what it would cost to have it developed in-house. The reality is they already have the data in the correct format, as that is what is used to produce the poll rosters. Now it is a matter of taking the data and putting it into an electronic format. The biggest issue is developing a way to search data, particularly with MVD changing the format of driver's licenses. They would need to create a system that recognizes both types of bar codes. Another advantage to having the program developed in-house is the ability to immediately correct any glitches.

Bill Beard asked Chris Roads if there was any potential liability to Pima County and the Recorder's office for having voter registration data in the cloud. Chris responded that there isn't, and they are required to provide voter registration information to the recognized political parties free of charge and in a CD format. Any time data is released from the Recorder's office, they are always concerned about where it will go.

Tom Ryan asked Brad if he was actively pursuing other vendors who could provide this service. Brad responded that, at this time, no; this was an experiment. Aside from their product, they had complaints about this vendor as well. Another of his concerns is that it is a very small organization and they may be overreaching as they look to expand their customer base. Pima County is not "married" to Knowlnk in any way. The electronic poll book could be advantageous for a variety of reasons, but other products that Brad has looked at appear to have their own problems such as security and usability. Brad gave the example of the vendor that Maricopa County is using, where on election morning each polling place receives updates on a thumb drive. This may be how they get around using the cloud for data, but it brings up other issues such as what happens if the updates aren't completed on time before the polls open? Brad would love to see the system developed in-house within Pima County.

Chris Cole asked if the program were developed by Pima County, could it perhaps be sold to the smaller counties in Arizona that because of lack of resources are limited to purchasing a commercial product. Chris Roads responded that the possibility of doing that is there and the offer of the programming system Pima County uses has been made to the State. It would be easy to do if the database were applied to one server per county and the Recorder's office could log in remotely; however, it creates an administrative issue with logging into numerous laptops at different polling sites.

Arnie Urken asked about the security of moving the data up to and down from the cloud and how the vendor deals with that. Chris Roads responded that the conversation most likely occurred with his IT staff, but he knows that the data was encrypted when it left the Recorder's office and it was uploaded to an FTP site rather than the cloud.

Matt Smith asked if doing it in-house would be more cost effective; Chris' response was that often it is more cost effective.

Benny White requested a task for both Brad Nelson and Chris Roads for the January meeting, to provide a draft road map of where this issue is going to go. The removal of polling place scanners was somewhat contingent on the e-poll books' success. What he is hearing now is that the e-poll books are not working. Whether or not they are successful for the future, there needs to be a contingency plan to include funding in the budget for precinct scanners. Chris stated that production of an in-house system will require testing in November 2015 for the potential county-wide bond election, and Recorder's staff has been told that any production must be completed by then. If the bond election is

not called, there will not be the opportunity to test the system prior to the 2016 Primary Election. Benny requested that all this be included in a project timeline for the budget committee to set aside funding. Chris said that his budget is usually completed and turned in by the first week of January, so if this is the direction Pima County is headed, he will have already put it in the Recorder's budget, and he will let the EIC know that he has done that. Barbara asked if the project timeline could be completed by December; both Chris Roads and Brad responded no. From Chris Roads' perspective, it isn't just the election in November that will prohibit this deadline; the Recorder's office is being relocated to the new courthouse building in the spring of 2015 and equipment and operations will need to begin moving in December.

Tom Ryan brought up his concern that in the future, there will be real time communication between e-poll books and a County system on Election Day. Brad concurred, stating that communication would be needed first thing in the morning to get early ballot addenda, etc. But if there isn't the requirement for certain information, such as keeping track of turnout during the day in one central location, whether the polling place opened on time, are any locations running low on ballots, etc., there wouldn't be the need for real time communication. Those things are advantageous, but not necessary to the administration of the election. Tom recognized the need for that communication first thing in the morning for updates. His concern is for how secure that communication will be and this needs to be discussed with the vendor.

Arnie asked Chris if they ask the vendor for assurances that they won't in any way process and distribute voter registration data—even internally—without informing or seeking permission from the Recorder's office. Chris responded that signed confidentiality agreements are typically required. The issue with KnowInk is that the Recorder's office does not have a contract with them; the contract is with the Elections Department. Even with signed confidentiality agreements, enforcement is difficult. Benny mentioned there is a criminal statute to cover this; however, it is difficult to prove because the voter registration data is so widely disseminated.

ITEM 7. SECURITY OF E-POLL BOOKS – Tom Ryan

- **Data**
- **Communication**

This item was covered during discussion of Item 6.

ITEM 8. CONTINENTAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT ISSUE – Brad Nelson

Brad provided a handout that contained a press release from the County School Superintendent summarizing a ballot printing error and the solution, a list of the precincts involved, a proof copy of the Continental School District Special Election ballot, and a copy of the General Election Ballot showing the error in the Continental School District governing board race [a copy of this handout is incorporated into these minutes as Attachment 1]. There are three candidates, and the ballot incorrectly says, "Vote for not more than 3." Brad has not yet seen the copy for any notification that will go to the voters from the County School Superintendent. Dr. Arzoumanian is in touch with the *Green Valley News*.

At the polling places for these precincts, voters will get a General Election ballot which will go into its own scanner or vote on the touchscreen device for the General; they will also receive a smaller ballot with only the Continental School District candidates which will go into its own scanner, or use a separate touchscreen device. In each of these precincts, there will be two separate scanners, two accessible TSX machines, two poll rosters, two poll lists, two voter ID slips; additional poll workers will

be assisting in these precincts as well. Each of the ballot boxes will have big signs in both English and Spanish to differentiate ballots. The scanners will each only accept the correct size ballot.

All races on the General Election ballot will be reported except the Continental School District race; that will be reported on its own separate report. It will also have its own separate canvass and separate Logic and Accuracy Test.

For early voting, Chris Roads explained that the eleven-inch special ballot will be mailed to every voter in the Continental School District who has requested an early ballot. For new early ballot requests, the voter will receive two ballot packages. In the ballot package for Continental, there will be an explanation sheet.

Arnie Urken asked what a cost range might be for this extra work. Chris gave a rough estimate to the Superintendent of Schools at \$2.80 to \$2.90 per ballot. As of this moment, there had been 14,265 early ballot requests in the Continental School District. Arnie asked whose budget this will come out of; the Superintendent of Schools office has informed the Recorder's office they would pay the cost. Bill Beard asked how many ballots would be required; Brad responded that there are approximately 18,800 registered voters in the District, and about 70% of voters in that area vote early. Chris said these ballots are scheduled to be mailed on October 20th or 21st.

Bill Beard inquired what the statutory authority is for doing the second ballot. Chris Roads responded that there is no provision in the statutes or the Procedures Manual for "what happens when." Of all the options presented by the attorneys involved, the 2nd ballot option was the most palatable. There have been a couple of similar instances in Maricopa County where this exact procedure was used with success, and without having problems in court after the election. Bill then asked how the Recorder's office would track the people who received the first ballot and returned it, but did not return the second ballot; how will that difference be tracked? If the number of voters who only returned the first ballot is greater than the difference in the election, that is grounds for an immediate lawsuit. Chris' response was that although he mailed out ballots to 14,000 voters, in virtually every election, 70% return them and 30% do not return the early ballot and don't vote in any election for any race. Of those, because this is a separate election, he will know exactly who returned an early ballot for one or both. There is also the possibility that some voters will only return their school district ballot and not their General Election ballot, as there is much publicity in the Green Valley area on the school issue. There is no complete win in resolving this situation, so the real issue is how do we least impact the voters, and get the results from the voters who wish to participate, in the best way possible? Had we not gone with this solution, we would have to redo this in March 2015. This mistake was discovered early; the Continental School superintendent got her ballot on Saturday [October 11th after ballots began being mailed on Thursday October 9th], she called the Pima County Superintendent of Schools who then notified the Recorder's office Sunday. By 6:30 a.m. on Monday [October 13th], the process was started to examine options. Bill asked if the school district attorney was OK with this procedure; Chris responded he had not spoken with the attorney since the contractual relationship is with the Superintendent's office. To Chris' knowledge, the school district has not put up any opposition, as long as something is done to correct it. When asked about the candidates, Chris responded that is also through the Superintendent's office. The Recorder's office role is to carry out whatever decision is made.

Benny predicts that the turnout for this race will be higher than other school district elections, because it will be the only measure on the ballot. Typically voters don't get that far down a long ballot. Secondly, he realizes this is a school board election and the Superintendent is the election official; however, each of the major parties had 40 or 50 races on the General Election ballot, and the parties were given no notice that there was any kind of a problem. Benny found out about it when no

return reports were issued on Wednesday [October 15th]. Notice is not required by statute; however, it caused a tremendous turmoil and distrust within the party structure—county, state and at the national level. Benny said he had people calling from Washington, DC wanting to know why Pima County was trying to rig the election. In the future, Benny suggests that, even though it isn't required, if something like this happens again that has this significant of an impact, the Pima County election officials should have the courtesy of notifying the recognized parties.

Tom Ryan asked where the source of the error was, and what happened to quality control? Brad responded that is being investigated at this time. Proofs were sent to the County Superintendent's office; on the County Superintendent's website, it still shows a vote for three even now. Who proofed at the Superintendent level and whether or not it was given to the school district to proof, is unknown. After sending the proofs to the County Superintendent, the Elections Department received the OK to print the ballot. Other jurisdictions with governing boards, such as fire districts and water districts, provide notice to the Elections Department of how many seats are to be elected. However, the point of contact for school districts is the County School Superintendent. The Elections Department does not contact all the school district superintendents. The governing board candidates do not file [their nomination paperwork], they file with the Superintendent's office and then the Superintendent's office notifies the Elections Department of who the candidates are who are running in the various school districts. Tom asked who within the Elections Department provides quality control when ballots are designed; Brad said they are reviewed by three or four people in the Elections Department, one of whom is Brad. Then all the school district ballots are sent to the County School Superintendent's office for review. Tom asked if this suggests anything to avoid mistakes in the future; Brad responded that in the future, when the Superintendent's office sends the list of candidates for each school board, they will also need to include the number to elect in each district. Right now, they just send the list of candidates, and then Elections Department staff goes to their website—where that erroneous information is still posted—to find out how many are to be elected.

Pat Pecoraro asked Chris if he would be able to provide statistics in December of how many people in the Continental School District voted a school district ballot only, how many voted just a General Election ballot, and how many voted both ballots. Chris responded that he should be able to provide that information by December.

Bill Beard asked Brad if the fact that the "Vote for 3" with three candidates on the ballot could have been a flag, because in that case, the election should have been cancelled. Brad responded that some school districts decide to have the election regardless.

ITEM 9. COST OF ELECTIONS – Tom Ryan

- **5 Questions**

Tom Ryan requested that this issue be placed back on the Agenda because there were some issues left hanging. Mickey Duniho had put together a list of five questions that might be addressed by data collected on election costs [a copy of the list of five questions proposed by Mickey Duniho is incorporated into these minutes as Attachment 2]. On Mickey's sheet, there is a "Projected 2014 Costs" segment. Tom thought of another question: An accounting of projected costs versus actual costs and an explanation of any significant increases.

Since questions 4 and 5 would require action from the Legislature to implement, Barbara Tellman asked if the intention of these questions was to provide information to the Legislature for potential changes. Chris Cole responded that it could be information to present to the Board of Supervisors asking them to take it to the Legislature. Tom said that having the information could be a factor in

whether or not to push the issue. He also said that there is no mechanism in place to answer these questions, unless somebody would like to take them on as a project, or to tell Brad that it is important enough for someone on his staff to take them on.

Bill Beard remembered that the consensus of the Commission is that the analysis provided by the Recorder's office and Elections Department [of election costs for 2012] was valuable information. Having that information available come budget time would be helpful in advising the Board of Supervisors. One of the reasons these questions were developed was to refine how this data would be sorted.

Chris Cole stated that originally this discussion started with question 4 and what if any cost savings there would be with all-mail elections and whether or not there would be an increase in fraud, and then the discussion expanded from there. Tom said that there has also been quite a bit of discussion about question 1 and removing scanners, and it appears the County is moving forward with that even without the cost accounting. Brad responded that the recommendation was made not only for cost savings in the purchase of the scanners, but also as a result in the trend toward early voting. And given that trend, should the County invest in polling place equipment? If not, the County would save approximately \$1.8 million for the purchase of the scanners, plus additional funds for servicing, storing, delivery and pickup, the Logic and Accuracy testing, etc., of the equipment for use on Election Day. Does the Commission want a breakdown on the additional costs? Tom responded it should include all issues with servicing the equipment. Bill Beard mentioned that for those precincts that did not have scanners, more time was required of Election Department personnel on the SNAG Board to analyze differences between reports done at the polling place and what was actually received. Projecting that out to all precincts, there will be more time involved for these SNAG Board activities. Brad responded that what will be attempted in the upcoming election in the pilot precincts is an ongoing self-audit at the polling location. At those polling locations without scanners, there will be two electronic poll books; in the past there was only one poll list. For this election there will be a separate poll list for each electronic poll book. Each poll book records how many voters have signed in on that particular poll book, and should be a reflection of the names and the number of entries on the poll list. The poll list clerk for that particular poll list will fill out the Notice to Voters slip [Voter ID Slip] that is then given to the ballot judge to issue the appropriate ballot. What will be requested is that throughout the day—four times, if the volume of voters allows—the poll workers will audit the number of entries on the poll lists, the number of entries on the electronic poll book and the Voter ID Slips. At the end of the evening the poll workers will be able to confirm that they balance; or, if not, when an exception occurred and what the circumstances were. If they document the exception as it happens, a lot less time will be spent at the SNAG Board.

Tom requested that Brad be sensitive to any procedural modifications that are required to be made as a result of the change of the presence of a scanner and e-poll book, and the financial impact of these modifications.

Barbara asked how much extra time will be required to process ballots not counted at the polling places if scanners are removed. Brad responded that one variable is that this will be the last election using the old equipment. But he will attempt to project that for the December meeting.

Arnie questioned that, with the lack of scanners, thereby removing the opportunity for a voter to correct an error on their ballot, how might this affect the amount of confidence the public has in Pima County's election system. Tom responded that after this pilot project is completed, members of the Commission are going to want to discuss this issue at the following meeting.

Tom's proposed sixth question has to do with the cost projections versus actual costs, and what are the major causes for any differences? Brad asked if this was General to General, or Primary and General; the response was that on Mickey's sheet it shows projected cost for Primary and General, so that would be how it should be reported.

Tom summarized the six questions: Brad will provide input on question 1, cost savings of removing scanners from polling places. Question 2, increased cost of sorting early ballots for hand-count audit, will be discussed in Item 10. Question 3, increased cost of two-page or bifurcated ballots, will incur additional costs but there are no other options other than possibly negotiating a reimbursement from the State. Question 4, cost savings by having all-mail elections, and question 5, cost savings of a closed primary versus open primary system, are not subject to local control. Brad mentioned there has been some movement in the Legislature to provide an option to counties with an election not part of any State election, to conduct the election as all-mail, similar to municipalities that do elections all by mail. Question 6, an accounting of projected costs versus actual costs and an explanation of any significant increases, will be addressed by Brad.

ITEM 10. EARLY BALLOT HAND COUNT AUDIT – Tom Ryan

Barbara Tellman stated that with the new tabulating system, this is irrelevant since the computer will be able to sort ballot images by precinct. Brad Nelson concurred with her. In addition to current early ballot processing procedures, the new equipment will make an image of both sides of the ballot which, according to the vendor, can be sorted by precinct thereafter. Ballots will not be physically sorted, but the images can be sorted by whatever criteria are defined. Questions were asked about being able to determine what day and what time of day ballots were tabulated; Brad responded he does not know the answer.

Tom Ryan and Bill Beard will get together to define options, but the fact that images can be produced of the ballots and sorted may change this discussion somewhat. Tom asked if there was anything that would prohibit printing of a precinct's worth of ballot images. Brad mentioned that this will be more than a Pima County concern going forward as other counties may need to address this issue. Bill stated that there will probably be something concerning digital images and how they are handled in the next Legislative session, and related to that would be the issue of whether those images would be public documents. Currently, ballots are not considered public documents in Arizona. There are differing opinions on whether digital images are considered public documents.

Arnie Urken asked whether the tabulating equipment on order has the capability of performing digital adjudication of ballots. Brad responded that the equipment offers the option, but that will not be used in Pima County because that is not permitted by the State. Arnie asked what will happen if there is an inconsistency between an audit of the printed ballots and tabulated results. Will it be done again? Tom stated that the statute describes exactly what to do in the case of a discrepancy, and there is a board that meets at the state level to define what a discrepancy is. Arnie said that is all in the context of existing technology, but how does this digital option change that?

Regarding the issue of online adjudication, Brad gave this synopsis: The ballots are scanned, and at the end of that scan, there may be ballots that require additional review. Those ballots will be reviewed physically to determine the errors on the ballots. Those ballots can be sent where the determination of voter intent is made by a Duplication Board and not just by one person. As Brad understands the online adjudication function, one person can actually add a vote to the database that is not on the ballot. The Pima County Elections Department will not do that.

ITEM 11. ES&S DATABASE INFORMATION – Tom Ryan

Tom Ryan stated that Pima County is under the requirement to provide the database information to the political parties. The current system is capable of providing that data in a format that is readable by Microsoft Access, making it possible to analyze the data in the database to make sure there is nothing inconsistent with the data. With the new system, this data is not accessible in the same way. The program that accesses the database can access the information, but there is currently no other application that can read the data. Tom said Brad Nelson has been communicating with ES&S on this issue, but ES&S doesn't appear to understand the problem. Tom would also like to have a contact in ES&S that he can deal directly with. Brad said that Ken Carbullido from ES&S was at the demonstration, and if anything is to be known about the system and how it works, Ken will know. And since he is the go-to person for any election software or hardware issues, he is pretty busy right now. Brad will give him a call but he doesn't know how soon Ken will be able to get in touch with Tom. Tom said he can wait until after the election. Brad also thought Ken might be present when the new system is installed in Pima County, at which time, Tom could see him; Tom would like to at least contact him by phone or e-mail before that time to broach the subject.

Arnie Urken asked Tom if this is an issue that should be discussed at the national level to make it a requirement for EAC certification. Tom responded that he feels it should be; there should be some protocol for analyzing databases. Barbara Tellman recalled asking at the demonstration if there would be a read-only version of the program for that purpose; she was told that it is possible, though they don't have that now.

ITEM 12. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Brad will be canvassing the General Election on November 18th, so an Agenda Item for reviewing the November 4, 2014 General Election is appropriate.

ITEM 13. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting date was set for Friday, November 21, 2014.

ITEM 14. CALL TO PUBLIC

No audience present.

ITEM 15. ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Bill Beard and seconded by Barbara Tellman and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 10:53 a.m.

ATTACHMENT 1



Linda Arzoumanian, Ed.D.
Pima County School Superintendent

Debbie D'Amore
Chief Deputy

200 North Stone Avenue • Tucson, Arizona 85701
www.schools.pima.gov • Email: schools@schools.pima.gov

Phone: 520.724.8451
Fax: 520.724.9308

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
October 16, 2014

Contact: Ricky Hernández
(520) 724-8451
ricky.hernandez@schools.pima.gov

Printing Error on Continental School District Board Election Ballot

Earlier this week it was brought to the attention of the Pima County School Superintendent's Office of a printing error in the voting instructions on the early ballots for the Continental Elementary School District Governing Board election. The early ballots instructed voters in Continental to vote for no more than three (3) candidates in that particular Governing Board race. However, these instructions were incorrect. There are currently three (3) candidates seeking a seat on the Continental Governing Board, but there are only two (2) available seats. Voters should have been initially instructed to **vote for no more than two (2)**.

After being notified of the error and after a discussion with the various County election officials, the Superintendent of Schools requested that the Elections Department and the Recorder's Office reissue a separate ballot for the Continental Governing Board election only. Individuals who have already submitted an early ballot will be required to revote a new ballot for the Continental election only. The votes for all other races and issues on the ballot will still be counted. Continental voters at polling places at the November General Election will also be provided with two ballots – one ballot with all the eligible races for those voters and a separate ballot containing the Continental School Board race only. Voters in Continental will receive a separate notice in the mail this weekend notifying them of the error and the process undertaken to correct it.

If voters have questions regarding the separate early ballot that will be issued by the Recorder's Office, they may call the Pima County Recorder's Office at (520) 724-4330. For any additional questions or concerns, please contact the Superintendent of Schools at (520) 724-8451.

###

The Pima County School Superintendent's Office promotes educational excellence
through leadership, service, and collaboration.

POLLING PLACE LIST
BY PRECINCT

NOVEMBER 4, 2014 SPECIAL ELECTION
Continental School District Special Governing Board Election

PCT	V-AREA	PCT-COMBOS	PRECINCT NAME	PRECINCT ADDRESS	ROOM LOCATION
10	10	10	EAST SOCIAL CENTER	7 S ABREGO DRIVE	AUDITORIUM
74	74	74	DESERT HILLS SOCIAL CENTER	2980 S CAMINO DEL SOL	ROOM A
84	84	84	QUAIL CREEK MADERA CLUBHOUSE	2055 E QUAIL CROSSING BOULEVARD	SILVER ROOM
141	141	141	CASA PALOMA I RECREATION CENTER	400 N CIRCULO DEL PALADIN	RECREATION ROOM
193	193	193	SANTA RITA SPRINGS RECREATION CENTER	921 W VIA RIO FUERTE	FIESTA ROOM
205	205	205	CANOA RANCH RECREATION CENTER	5750 S TURQUOISE MOUNTAIN DRIVE	AMADO ROOM
206	206	206	ABREGO SOUTH RECREATION CENTER	1655 S ABREGO DRIVE	RECREATION ROOM
207	207	207	ST. FRANCIS IN THE VALLEY EPISCOPAL CHURCH	600 S LA CANADA DRIVE	PARISH HALL
209	209	209	PUEBLO ESTATES HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION	145 W ALISO DRIVE	CLUBHOUSE

PRECINCT / DISTRITO ELECTORAL 141 - 0

OFFICIAL BALLOT
BOLETA OFICIAL

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 2014
PIMA COUNTY, STATE OF ARIZONA
ELECCION GENERAL
4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 2014
CONDADO DE PIMA, ESTADO DE ARIZONA

To vote for the candidates, fill in the oval to the left of the name of the candidate. To vote for a person not on the ballot, write the candidate's name in the write-in space and fill in the oval to the left of the write-in space. VOTE LIKE THIS: 

Para votar por los candidatos, llene el óvalo a la izquierda del nombre del candidato. Para votar por una persona que no aparece en la boleta, escriba el nombre del candidato en el espacio de votación por escrito y llene el óvalo a la izquierda del espacio. VOTE ASI: 

CONTINENTAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 39 / DIST. E.P. NUM. 39 DE CONTINENTAL
GENERAL ELECTION / ELECCION GENERAL

GOVERNING BOARD
CONTINENTAL ELEMENTARY S.D. #39
CONSEJO DE ADMINISTRADOR
DIST. E.P. NUM. 39 DE CONTINENTAL

VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 2
VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 2

ARELLANO, SERGIO

NICKL, RALPH J.

NIEHAUS, SHARON R.

PROOF

TEST

PRECINCT / DISTRITO ELECTORAL 010 - 0

OFFICIAL BALLOT
BOLETA OFICIAL

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 2014
PIMA COUNTY, STATE OF ARIZONA
ELECCION GENERAL
4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 2014
CONDADO DE PIMA, ESTADO DE ARIZONA

Section One - Partisan Ballot
To vote for the candidates, fill in the oval to the left of the name of the candidate. To vote for a person not on the ballot, write the candidate's name in the write-in space and fill in the oval to the left of the write-in space. PARTY ABBREVIATIONS: REP-REPUBLICAN, DEM-DEMOCRATIC, LBT-LIBERTARIAN, GRN-GREEN, AEL-AMERICANS ELECT.

Section Two - Non-Partisan Ballot
To vote for the candidates, fill in the oval to the left of the name of the candidate. To vote for a person not on the ballot, write the candidate's name in the write-in space and fill in the oval to the left of the write-in space. If you wish to vote for the adoption of a proposition or question, fill in the oval to the left of "YES". If you wish to vote against the adoption of a proposition or question, fill in the oval to the left of "NO". VOTE LIKE THIS: YES NO

Primera Sección - Boleta Partidaria
Para votar por los candidatos, llene el óvalo a la izquierda del nombre del candidato. Para votar por una persona que no aparece en la boleta, escriba el nombre del candidato en el espacio de votación por escrito y llene el óvalo a la izquierda del espacio. ABBREVIATURAS PARTIDARIAS: REP-REPUBLICANO, DEM-DEMOCRATA, LBT-LIBERTARIO, GRN-VERDE, AEL-AMERICANOS/ELEGI.

Sección Dos - Boleta No Partidaria
Para votar por los candidatos, llene el óvalo a la izquierda del nombre del candidato. Para votar por una persona que no aparece en la boleta, escriba el nombre del candidato en el espacio de votación por escrito y llene el óvalo a la izquierda del espacio. Si quería votar en pro de la adopción de alguna proposición o pregunta, llene el óvalo a la izquierda del "SI". Si quería votar en contra de la adopción de alguna proposición o pregunta, llene el óvalo a la izquierda del "NO". VOTE ASI: SI NO

Section One - Partisan Ballot Primera Sección - Boleta Partidaria	SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION SUPERINTENDENTE DE INSTRUCCION PUBLICA VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 1	GOVERNING BOARD CONTINENTAL ELEMENTARY S.D. #39 CONSEJO DE ADMINISTRADOR DIST. E.P. NUM. 39 DE CONTINENTAL VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 3 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 3	Shall STANFORD, KENNETH C., Judge of the Superior Court, Div. 26 be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto STANFORD, KENNETH C., Juez de la Corte Superior, Div. 26? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO
UNITED STATES OFFICES CARGOS DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS	<input type="radio"/> GARCIA, DAVID DEM <input type="radio"/> DOUGLAS, DIANE M. REP <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> ARELLANO, SERGIO <input type="radio"/> NICKL, RALPH J. <input type="radio"/> NIEHAUS, SHARON R.	Shall BROWNING, CHRISTOPHER C., Judge of the Superior Court, Div. 27 be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto BROWNING, CHRISTOPHER C., Juez de la Corte Superior, Div. 27? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, DISTRICT 2 REPRESENTANTE DE LOS EE.UU. ANTE EL CONGRESO, DISTRITO 2 VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 1	<input type="radio"/> BARBER, RON DEM <input type="radio"/> MCSALLY, MARTHA REP <input type="radio"/>	STATE MINE INSPECTOR INSPECTOR ESTATAL DE MINAS VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 1	<input type="radio"/> HART, JOE REP
STATE OFFICES CARGOS ESTATALES	CORPORATION COMMISSIONER COMISIONARIO DE CORPORACIONES VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 2 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 2	ARIZONA SUPREME COURT TRIBUNAL SUPREMO DE ARIZONA	Shall BALES, SCOTT, Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto BALES, SCOTT, Juez de la Tribunal Supremo de Arizona? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO
GOVERNOR GOBERNADOR VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 1	<input type="radio"/> KENNEDY, SANDRA DEM <input type="radio"/> HOLWAY, JIM DEM <input type="radio"/> LITTLE, DOUG REP <input type="radio"/> FORESE, TOM REP	Shall BRUTINEL, ROBERT, Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto BRUTINEL, ROBERT, Juez de la Tribunal Supremo de Arizona? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO	<input type="radio"/>
STATE SENATOR, DIST. 2 SENADOR ESTATAL, DIST. 2 VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 1	COUNTY OFFICES CARGOS DEL CONDADO	SUPERIOR COURT TRIBUNAL SUPERIOR	Shall HARRINGTON, CHARLES V., Judge of the Superior Court, Div. 2 be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto HARRINGTON, CHARLES V., Juez de la Corte Superior, Div. 2? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO
<input type="radio"/> DALESSANDRO, ANDREA DEM <input type="radio"/> ESTRELLA, DANIEL REP	CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT ARCHIVERO DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 1	Shall LIWSKI, DANELLE BENNETT, Judge of the Superior Court, Div. 6 be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto LIWSKI, DANELLE BENNETT, Juez de la Corte Superior, Div. 6? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO	<input type="radio"/>
STATE REPRESENTATIVE, DIST. 2 REPRESENTANTE ESTATAL, DIST. 2 VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 2 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 2	JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT 7 JUEZ DE PAZ, DISTRITO ELECTORAL 7 VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 1	Shall MARNER, JAMES E., Judge of the Superior Court, Div. 10 be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto MARNER, JAMES E., Juez de la Corte Superior, Div. 10? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> CLINCO, DEMON DEM <input type="radio"/> GABALDÓN, ROSANNA DEM <input type="radio"/> ACKERLEY, JOHN CHRISTOPHER REP	<input type="radio"/> HELLON, TONI REP <input type="radio"/> ROYAL, LISA REP	Shall NICHOLS, RICHARD D., Judge of the Superior Court, Div. 14 be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto NICHOLS, RICHARD D., Juez de la Corte Superior, Div. 14? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO	<input type="radio"/>
SECRETARY OF STATE SECRETARIO DE ESTADO VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 1	BOARD OF DIRECTORS CENTRAL ARIZONA WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT MIEMBRO, MESA DIRECTIVA DISTRITO DE CENTRAL ARIZONA WATER CONSERVATION VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 4 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 4	Shall CHON-LÓPEZ, JAVIER, Judge of the Superior Court, Div. 15 be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto CHON-LÓPEZ, JAVIER, Juez de la Corte Superior, Div. 15? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> GODDARD, TERRY DEM <input type="radio"/> REAGAN, MICHELE REP	<input type="radio"/> TENNEY, WARREN <input type="radio"/> JACOBS, PAT <input type="radio"/> MEGDAL, SHARON <input type="radio"/> MEHL, WESLEY <input type="radio"/> NOVAK CESARE, KAREN	Shall WOODS, CATHERINE M., Judge of the Superior Court, Div. 17 be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto WOODS, CATHERINE M., Juez de la Corte Superior, Div. 17? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO	<input type="radio"/>
ATTORNEY GENERAL PROCURADOR GENERAL VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 1	<input type="radio"/> ROTELLINI, FELECIA DEM <input type="radio"/> BRNOVICH, MARK REP	Shall QUIGLEY, KATHLEEN A., Judge of the Superior Court, Div. 19 be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto QUIGLEY, KATHLEEN A., Juez de la Corte Superior, Div. 19? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO	<input type="radio"/>
STATE TREASURER TESORERO ESTATAL VOTE FOR NOT MORE THAN 1 VOTE POR NO MAS QUE 1	<input type="radio"/> DEWIT, JEFF REP	Shall BERGIN, JEFFREY T., Judge of the Superior Court, Div. 22 be retained in office? ¿Deberá permanecer en su puesto BERGIN, JEFFREY T., Juez de la Corte Superior, Div. 22? <input type="radio"/> YES/SI <input type="radio"/> NO	<input type="radio"/>

ATTACHMENT 2

5 QUESTIONS FOR ELECTION COSTS

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:						% of 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?