

The purchase of new voting equipment



Struggling with voting machine expirations

By William Anthony Jr., Director , Franklin County Board of Elections

THIS IS A QUESTION OF RESOURCES, WHERE WILL THE FUNDS COME FROM...

- HAVA gave Ohio more than \$100 million dollars in 2004 just for voting machines.
- This money was used to replace archaic punch cards and other ballot technology with Electronic or optical scan voting machines.
- Now a decade later, these systems; like much computer technology of that age, are reaching the end of their operational life.
(who is still using a computer or cell phone that they purchased in 2004?)
- Will there be more federal money to help out? Will there be state money? Or will counties have to foot the entire bill?
(This conversation must begin sooner rather than later)

WHAT IS GOING ON AROUND THE COUNTRY? HOW ARE OTHER JURISDICTIONS DEALING WITH THIS?

The Presidential Commission on Elections Administration

- Strongly recommended addressing this looming crisis in voting technology and, in particular, reforming the standards and certification process for voting technology.

In the state of Maryland

- A 2010 report by the Research Triangle Institute found that the AccuVote Ts voting machines used in Maryland were approaching the end of their expected 10-year life and continued use of the system beyond 2012 increased the risk of malfunctions. Governor Martin O'Malley allocated \$12 million in the state's 2014 fiscal year budget.

In Travis County, Texas which includes Austin

- They are proactively taking on these challenges. In 2012, after using the eSlate DRE voting system for more than a decade, the county began working with computer and usability experts to write specifications for a new systems called STAR (for security, transparency, auditability, and reliability). Total cost of software and development will be around \$8.5 million

In Los Angeles County California

- One of the largest elections jurisdictions in the country, the Registrar-Recorder and County Clerk's office launched the Voting Systems Assessment Project in 2009 seeking public input to help determine voter's current and future needs. By the midterm elections in 2018 Los Angeles County voters are expected to use tablet computers to mark their ballots, replacing the current ink ballot marking system that dates to 1968. the new system will cost roughly \$42 million and will be partially funded by a bill to update voting systems (S.B.360), which passed last year and provides \$200 million in state bond funds to help counties pay for new voting equipment.



WHAT ARE OUR MAJOR CHALLENGES

- County jurisdictions allocating limited resources in their Budget to purchase new voting systems. Costs can range from \$3500 to \$4,000 a voting machine not to mention the 100's of thousands a year on maintenance costs and licensing fees.
- State legislation to assist in funding to pay for new voting systems.
- Lobbying the federal government for more HAVA like funding.
- Availability of new voting equipment that meet federal and local standards.
- The lack of a fully functioning Elections Assistance Commission (EAC) to adopt new standards.
- Voting machine manufactures being timid about developing new technologies because the standard-setting process for new voting machines has broken down.
- Computer science community and advocacy groups concerns about the security of computers in the conduct of elections.

THE BOTTOM LINE

- Our voting machines are old technology.
- Counties are cash strapped.
- We can not keep pace with evolving technology.
- Buying hundreds of expensive specialized pieces of hardware good for only one purpose, ELECTIONS – *no longer makes sense*.
- The lack of up-to-date standards has impeded the inevitable and much-needed transition of the voting process to off-the-shelf technology.
- Time is of the Essence we do not have the luxury of waiting until we have machine failures.

ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS?

- **Should new systems be county-owned and operated?**
- **Should it rely on open-source software that can be shared across jurisdictions?**
- **Should we require equipment that can be brought commercially off the shelf, like tablets and scanners?**
- **Who are the stake holders that should be at the table as we move forward?**

E-poll books

Tim Ward, Director
Madison County Board of Elections

Current System

- Paper Signature Books
- Paper Poll Books
- Costly and Time Consuming to Print
- Costly and Time Consuming to Process after Election

Certification

- SB 109, certification of electronic poll books
- Ohio Board of Voting Machine Examiners have authorized four electronic poll-books for use in upcoming elections
 - EA Tablet System[®] (Election Administrators)
 - ExpressPoll-5000[®] (ES&S)
 - ExpressPoll[®] Table System (ES&S)
 - Poll Pad (KnowInk[™])

E-poll book Benefits

- No Scanning – Hours vs. Days
- Database With ALL Voters and Addresses
- Reduces Precinct Election Official Errors
- Quicker Voter Processing Time
- Print Voter Posting Lists (6:30, 11:00 and 4:00)
- Voter Turnout in Real-Time
- Some can be used on multiple platforms such as phone, tablet, or workstation

EA Tablet System[®]

(Election Administrators)



- EA Tablet is an Android Device
- Bluetooth printer available
- Scans Drivers' Licenses with the built-in camera
- Over the Air (Wi-Fi) database and software installation option
- Micro SD Card database and software installation option
- Search for voters by last name, first name, date of birth, voter ID number and/or address
- Search for polling place and ballot information by voter address
- Continuous, real-time backup of voter history to micro SD card

ExpressPoll-5000[®]

(ES&S)



- Print voter verification sheets, display maps and addresses of a voter's polling location and produce polling place reports
- Voter Identification - Signature pad enables precinct election officials to compare captured signatures with those stored in the voter registration system and accurately update them as needed
- Voter Information – Full name, address, precinct, Voter ID number, date of birth, driver's license number, voter status or requirements.

ExpressPoll[®] Tablet System (ES&S)



Integrated Peripherals

- ExpressPoll[®] in an Android Device
- Built in Signature Pad and Barcode Reader

Redundant Data Storage

- Validation information is stored in solid state internal memory card and on a Micro-SD card

Wireless Networking

- Communicates with other tablets in a precinct using secure, wireless networking, eliminating the need for cables as well as hubs or switches.

Bluetooth Connectivity

- The receipt-style printer, optional external keyboard, and other peripherals connect to the system through Bluetooth technology.

Poll Pad (KnowInk™)



- Poll Pad is contained entirely on an iPad®
- Built in Signature Pad and Barcode Reader
- Check-in Voters in 20 seconds or less
- Utilizes iCloud technology

Equipment Costs

- Poll book
- Maintenance
- Printers
- Scanners

Challenges

- Updating Information
- Cloud Availability at Polling Locations
- End of In-Office Voter Absentee Voting

State funding for election equipment?

Aaron Ockerman, Executive Director
Ohio Association of Election Officials

Goals

- Provide “lay of land” with regard to election issues in the legislature
- Discuss potential of state funding of election equipment. What is the good and bad?
- Potential strategy for funding, and plan of action
- Outline of arguments at our disposal

Lay of the land

- The BAD
 - Bitterly divided legislature
 - SB 200, 205, 216, 238 = election reform “fatigue”
 - Court intervention in legislative prerogatives
 - No precedent for state funding of election equipment
 - Fiscally conservative legislature not keen on new programs, Governor even less interested

Lay of the land (cont.)

- The GOOD
 - SB 109, certification of electronic poll books
 - Broad coalition of support for funding (CCAO, OAEO, LWV, COHHIO)
 - HAVA model was successful in distributing federal funds and is easy to replicate
 - Legislative interest by member of Senate leadership

Strategy for funding

- Educate members of legislature on voting machine replacement, but NO ASK until after the 2016 elections
- Target 2016/2017 operating budget for e-poll book funding

E-Poll book funding

- CCAO and OAEO adopt resolutions/public policy planks in favor of funding
- Begin meetings with potential champions during lame duck session
- Language already drafted but needs fine-tuning
- Stay close to and involve SOS and other IP's
- Formulate a grassroots plan for next spring

Arguments in our favor/talking points

- Machine replacement:
 - Equipment at end of lifespan. Who is using a cell phone or computer that is 10 years old?
 - As with all electronic equipment, failure WILL occur. It's just a matter of time. We have to replace BEFORE the failure, not AFTER.
 - State funding/purchase of election equipment allows us to maximize our buying power and get more for less.
 - It also allows for add-ons like warranty and maintenance which are not obtainable if counties negotiate individually.

Arguments in our favor/talking points (cont.)

- E-poll books
 - Win-win-win (funders, voters, and election administrators all benefit)
 - State already has certification process in place and recognizes the role of e-poll books in elections administration
 - E-poll books hold the key to future reforms and cost savings measures
 - As elections become more and more a function of the state, the legislature has an obligation to fund them

Conclusion

- It is not out of the realm of possibility to see state support for election related equipment
- However, the vast majority of legislators do not understand the dilemma facing counties and must be educated before they will act
- Tackling e-poll books first will set the precedent for the larger effort to fund voting machine replacement later