

CACEO - Voter's Choice Working Group

February 8, 2017 Meeting Notes

County and SOS Staff in Attendance

Madera	Orange	Susan Lapsley SOS	Todd Ross SOS
Los Angeles	Sacramento	Jana Lean SOS	Jon Ivy SOS
Tuolumne	Santa Cruz	Joanna Southard SOS	Karen DeVoe SOS
Santa Clara	Sutter	James Schwab SOS	Rachelle Delucchi SOS
Nevada	Shasta	Mike Somers SOS	Robbie Anderson SOS
San Mateo	San Luis Obispo	Leg Analysts Office	
Calaveras	Napa		

I. Secretary of State Update

After introductions, Susan Lapsley of the SOS presented regarding a variety of regulations, both those that have been drafted, and the process for moving forward with impending regulations. Dean Logan, CACEO chair, suggested that there may be interest among counties that are looking at purchasing new voting systems to form a subgroup to look at current and upcoming voting system standards. Susan suggested that there should be two work groups, one for current voting system standards, and one for voting system pilot projects. The next meeting will likely focus on these regulations and other issues relating to vote center data connectivity, records update timings, and security issues. The counties expressing interest in the subgroup were Orange, Sacramento, LA, Santa Clara, and Madera.

II. Toolkit development

Jana Lean of the SOS introduced the planning and preparation toolkit that is being developed. SOS staff has taken the lead on developing the initial items which include county by county profiles, a step by step sample timeline for meeting the requirements of the Voter's Choice Act, and a glossary of terms that can be used by the working group to ensure clear and consistent communication among members of the working group. She introduced Mike Somers from the SOS, the developer of the timeline and glossary. Mike walked through how to use the glossary and the timeline. There were several suggestions for updates to terms in the glossary. Mike also noted that he had developed a timeline with actual calendar dates and that calendar was requested to be made available. James Schwab from SOS expressed the office's willingness to help do BoS outreach and education, including personal visits by the Secretary himself, in order to build support for the model.

III. Small County Subcommittee

Donna Johnston of Sutter County introduced the concept behind the formation of a subcommittee of smaller counties, defined as those counties serving a total of registered voters less or equal to the total of San Luis Obispo County, and reported on their concerns. Staffing issues were the biggest concern expressed by the subcommittee related to implementing SB 450. Budgeting for implementation was the next biggest concern. Most wanted to implement the vote center model, but were concerned about a lack of support,

budgetary or otherwise, from their Boards of Supervisors. The subgroup is scheduled to meet again on March 3, 2017.

IV. County Updates

Calaveras – Draft EAP underway. Will be bringing the plan to their board, but doesn't want or feel the need to have approval from the Board to move forward. Their equipment is OK and they are currently exploring possible vote center locations. They would really like to have local buy-in for the project.

Madera – Very interested in implementing SB 450 for 2018. Money is an issue. They have an older voting system and are scheduled to have a demo of a new system in March 2017. Three of five Board members seem to be supportive, but they don't know a lot about the way SB 450 will work. They don't believe they need approval from the Board, but would very much like their blessing.

Napa – On pace to implement SB450 for the 2018 elections. Plan is to purchase Dominion 5.2 and ICX system. They are briefing the Board on March 21, 2017, regarding SB 450 implementation. Noted that the BPC is interested in addressing technical data circulation (batch processing vs. real time data)

Nevada – Staffing and money are the two biggest hurdles to implementing SB 450. They estimate they need 1 or 2 more people on staff. The Board is reluctant. Additionally, they are concerned about connectivity issues given the geography of the county. Also, they believe that some changes will need to be made to the law to make it more cost effective for their county.

Orange – They are being aggressive on planning. They are working towards a briefing for the Board by the end of March. They want the Board to OK implementation. Vote security is the biggest concern. Putting out RFP for vote center model issued in spring 2017. Holding 2 community meetings, one north and one south, and inviting Board members. They are shooting for a 4-1 approval vote. Sending surveys to the 50,000 vote center pilot voters. Have a community advisory committee in place already.

Sacramento – Board wants a survey completed (by telephone and done quickly). They need a new voting system regardless of whether they implement SB 450. Their polling place survey returned very positive response on vote centers by poll workers. They are meeting with their cities over the course of the next month.

San Luis Obispo – They are currently identifying possible vote center locations. They met with the Board Chair and received positive feedback. They would like the support of the other 4 Board members. They are also reaching out to community groups. Finally, they also will be purchasing a new voting system.

San Mateo – They are committed to moving forward on implementing SB 450. Their Board is supportive. The devil is in the details. Their VBM facility is dated and they have an RFP for a new system on the way. Staffing is also creating a budgeting issue. They do have a LAAC/VAAC in place currently

Santa Clara – They have money to purchase a new voting system. They will need e-poll books to implement SB 450. The contract for the new voting system purchase is on hold, though. They were shooting for implementing SB 450 in 2018, but given the hold they don't think this will be feasible until 2020.

Shasta – Their budget will likely remain flat. If this is the case they will not be able to implement SB 450 in 2018, even though they would like to do so. They need a new voting system, but also don't have the money for that.

Sutter – The political dynamics in the county are in flux. They are, never the less, moving forward with conversations with possible vote centers and poll workers. They are also working on creating a LAAC and VAAC.

Tuolumne – They are currently developing an EAP. They are briefing the Board on March 21, as well as reaching out to their community. There was no push back from poll workers when they discussed the new model. Staffing and money are challenges. They believe implementation will cost more than the polling place model. They also have a group of "VBM cheerleaders" that can help with outreach. Also, the Tea Party did an observation and report 4 years ago and issued a positive report that could help to alleviate concerns in the community about a new election administration plan.

V. Outreach Planning and Data

Aaron Nevarez of LA County presented a detailed account of how LA is coordinating with other county departments and agencies to gather and use geospatial information data to inform the planning process for siting vote centers. They are developing heat maps of voter activity. They have a three-pronged strategy to identify possible vote center locations. They are using geospatial analysis to identify socioeconomic information, transportation usage, employment location, and cultural locations. They are also taking a location inventory of possible sites for vote centers, including nontraditional locations like stadiums or other large public venues. Finally, they are working to ensure strong public engagement and outreach to communities for input.

VI. Meeting Conclusion

The meeting concluded with a discussion about meeting attendance. It was agreed that the working group would remain a joint group with SOS and county staff without attendees from outside groups, except for voting system vendors. Additionally, if non-pilot counties wanted to attend they would be allowed upon request, but not specifically invited to each meeting. The next meeting was set for March 22, 2017. The next agenda is set to include critical pathways for Elections in 2018, including calendars for adoption of regulations and voting system certifications.