Meeting Purpose

- Report is a summary of the six VEP Study Group sessions
- Review and discuss feedback section
  - Minority report deadline:
    - Noon, Friday, July 26
    - Email angie.nussmeyer@indy.gov with comments
  - MCEB will be presented with final version, including minority reports, at August meeting
    - 10AM, Wed., August 14, City-County Building Room 260

Study Group Report

- Three general sections
  - Introductory and background subsections
  - Substantive summary of Study Group review meetings
  - Study Group feedback

Introduction and Background

- Acknowledgements
- Executive Summary
- Mission Statement
- Report Format
- Introduction and Background
- VEP Study Group Membership
- Rules of Conduct
- History of Marion County Voting in HAVA Era
### Meeting Summaries

- Module No. 1: Election Fundamentals
- Module No. 2: Poll Workers & General Procedures
- Module No. 3: Polling Sites & Accessibility
- Module No. 4: Voting Technology, Part I (Current Voting System)
- Module No. 5: Voting Technology, Part II (Other Technology Options)
- Module No. 6: Election Administrator Roundtable & Cost Discussion

### Feedback Section

#### Disclaimer
- Feedback centers on voting system needs but does touch on other concerns raised during our sessions.
- Study Group and public perspectives are being provided for the benefit of the Marion County Election Board, but should not be considered recommend outcomes for the County.
  - As required by state law, replacing the county’s voting system will require a Request for Proposal or equivalent and portions of the Study Group and public feedback may be integrated in the proposal.
  - However, the Election Board is the administrative and governing body that will consider, deliberate, and make the concrete choices

#### Feedback: Overall Themes

- Voting must be accessible and convenient
- Voting equipment and associated costs must be effective (both short- and long-term)
- Technology should be used to improve the process without setting it back in unintended ways
- Overall voting process should be fundamentally fair and non-discriminatory
- Public must have confidence in the system

#### Voting Systems

- **Security**
  - Must improve upon or maintain same level of security of the current system
  - Current system meets or exceeds state and federal requirements
  - Current system is “closed,” meaning the proprietary software is licensed on a few machines that have no access to the Internet or other similar connections

#### Voting Systems (Continued)

- **Ease of Use**
  - Drastically simplify and improve voting machine initiation and shut down operations for poll workers
  - Simple instructions for voters to follow
  - Must be quick to tabulate a voter’s ballot
    - If system has paper ballot component, then optical scan component should meet or exceed current system’s speed
    - If using exclusively DRE equipment or a combination system using a touchscreen component, then county should purchase enough equipment to prevent long lines from forming

#### Voting Systems (Continued)

- **Accuracy**
  - New system should maintain or exceed current accuracy systems
- **Accessible (HAVA Compliant)**
  - New HAVA compliant machine should be integrated seamlessly into the system as a whole
  - Current system awkwardly ties the two together
  - Speed and intuitiveness of the audio-enabled ballot should be improved
  - Technology should incorporate other accessible features
Voting Systems (Continued)

- Adaptable
  - New system should be flexible to work in a variety of voting environments such as:
    - Election Day voting at a single precinct, ‘super’ precinct, vote center, etc.
    - Early voting at the Clerk’s office and other satellite locations
    - Absentee voting by mail or traveling board
    - Central count of absentee ballots
  - Preferable that machine be able to store ballot styles for and tabulate results from all of the county’s precincts

Paper-Trail Systems

- Many Study Group members:
  - Desire a new system to have verifiable and reviewable paper record of votes cast by each voter
  - Feel strongly this maintains ballot secrecy and voter confidentiality
- Other group members:
  - Eliminate paper due to its functional redundancy, inflexibility, inefficiencies, and ongoing costs.
  - Recognized potential that voters have less comfort and faith in such a system, but predicted that voters' comfort level would rise over time.

Paper-Trail Systems

- No General Consensus
  - Should paper-trail be:
    - Paper ballot that is optically scanned?
    - Verifiable “receipt” that is maintained within the system as a backup to electronic images?
    - Electronic image that can be stored and printed?

Electronic Systems

- Potential that electronic systems may be more expensive to purchase initially and maintain and replace over time
- Consensus
  - Not ready for exclusively electronic (no paper) at least at this point, however:
    - Electronic systems as a “front-end” voting input method was preferable given its greater accessibility for voters with disabilities
    - The ability to provide an individualized, secret, and cost effective paper record on the “back-end” was preferred

Purchase in 2014?

- Consensus
  - Current system is obsolete
  - Will need replacement in near term
    - Before widespread problems begin to occur using the current aging system
    - Avoid continued investment in an obsolete system
  - Depends largely on the ability of the county to fund the purchase

ePollbooks

- No consensus
  - Not enough information, too many questions
  - Potential to achieve greater efficiencies
  - Concerns about risks associated with connecting to a central server
  - Many polling places lack IT infrastructure for ePollbook to maintain a reliable connection to a central server
    - Would require county to purchase air cards and/or make investment in sites to bring them into compliance
  - Any ePollbook system in future should mitigate questions and risks
### Polling Sites

- Accessibility
  - Polling sites should be completely accessible:
    - Plentiful parking
    - Smooth Ingress/Egress
    - Plentiful Voting Space, especially when multiple precincts assigned
    - Amenities
- Familiarity
  - Polling sites should be familiar to voters
    - Close to voters' residences
    - Near public transportation to greatest extent possible
    - Facilitates planning and accessibility for voters with disabilities

### Polling Sites

- Consistency
  - Locations should not change year to year or election to election
    - Inconsistency leads to hardships for all voters, especially those with disabilities that require advance planning
  - Voters should be made aware of any change in polling locations whenever possible
- Care and Cooperation
  - Careful evaluation of location placement should occur
  - Mayor's office, Election Board and facility owners should work together
  - Revisions to voting facility contracts should occur

### Poll Workers

- Well-Trained
- Familiar and consistent assignments
- Checks and Balances
- Party Control
- Early voting decreases pressure on poll workers

### Vote Centers

- No consensus
- Associated issues:
  - Current voting technology not capable of running vote centers
  - Urban, high-density residences and precincts make planning more difficult
  - Need expanded early voting opportunities to reduce strain on sites
    - Travis County, Texas and Tippecanoe County, Indiana had 23 and 19 early voting sites in 2008 presidential, respectively
  - Complete party cooperation and unanimous vote needed to approve a plan

### Expanded Early Voting

- Reduces pressure on Election Day voting sites, systems and poll workers
  - Benefits accessibility of voting for voters with disabilities
  - Reduces poll worker workload
  - Reduces need for election day resources (i.e. voting machines, ballots, etc.)
  - Benefits election security
  - Adaptability
  - Expansion necessary if Vote Centers ever adopted

### Next Steps

**MINORITY REPORTS DUE:**
- Noon, Friday, July 26
- Email: **ANGIE.NUSSMEYER@INDY.GOV**

**STUDY GROUP REPORT PRESENTED TO MCEB**
- August 14, 2013 | 10AM | CCB, ROOM 260

**PHASE TWO: PUBLIC MEETINGS**
- Mid-September through October