

Technology Summit April 8, 2014 | Summary Report

A- Total attendees: 38

County Auditors: 10

County Staff: 17

- Benton: Brenda Chilton, Stuart Holmes
- Clark: Greg Kimsey
- Chelan: Skip Moore
- Cowlitz: Kris Swanson, Carolyn Meyer
- Jefferson: Donna Eldridge, Betty Johnson, Brenda Huntingford
- King: Dale Hartman
- Kitsap: Dolores Gilmore, Michael Aguirre
- Lincoln: Shelly Johnston
- Pierce: Julie Anderson, Shannon Cortez, Mike Rooney
- Skagit: Jeanne Youngquist, David Cunningham
- San Juan: Milene Henley, Kim Herrenkohl
- Snohomish: Carolyn Weikel, Garth Fell
- Thurston: Mary Hall, Tillie Naputi-Pullar, Lynnette Thornton
- Whatcom: Matt Shepherd, Diana Bradrick

OSOS Staff: 10

- Kim Wyman
- Mark Neary
- Dave Ammons
- Katie Blinn
- Mike Huntley
- Lori Augino
- Bill Teed
- Sheryl Moss
- Nick Pharris
- Cristina Labra

Other Agencies: 1

- DOL – Myke Gable

B- Fundamental question

Knowing what you know today about registration and tabulation systems – factoring in all federal and state requirements, and public expectations for accessibility, integrity, and earlier, meaningful results – would you build today the election system we currently have to meet our needs? If your answer is NO, we need to chart the course to prepare for the next 10 years.

C- Current challenges of our systems

- Funding
- Coordinating three county Election Management Systems
- Making changes and enhancements
- Keeping data in sync
- Running reports
- County-to-county transfers
- The three vendors respond differently to data sent down from VRDB
- Maintaining procedures for three systems
- Coordinating with three vendors (user groups)
- Lack of support for mobile devices
- Lack of cross-browser support
- MyBallot
- Online Voters' Guide presentation issues
- End of life of equipment

- Varying levels of commitment and customer service from vendors
- AVU's that few people use
- Lack of ability to respond quickly to legislative changes or litigation
- Lack of integration
- All systems have to share data and work together
- Not a very efficient system
- We increase our risk by requiring all of these systems to work together

D- Brainstorming session

Knowing the challenges we currently have, let's brainstorm these 3 areas:

1. Needs for Washington's elections system
2. Roadblocks to success
3. Best solutions

Summary of brainstorming session

Needs for WA's election systems	Roadblocks to success	Best solutions
<p><u>Policy/perception needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain county control of county data. • Increase voter and stakeholder trust. • Responsiveness to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Timelines and changes to our timelines. b. Overlapping elections and jurisdictions. • Meaningful election results on election night: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Tabulation. b. Posting cumulative results. • Certification: independent platform to provide flexibility. • Security and secrecy of the ballot. <p><u>Administrative and Financial needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scalable: Serve small and large counties. • Eliminate redundant data entry, eliminate multiple proofing. • Increased data exchange and communication with DOL. • Share information horizontally. • Continue relationship/partnership with good communication and communication channels at state and local levels. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Development b. Testing c. Implementation d. Maintenance <p><u>Usability needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide voter options. One time entry that meets different delivery options for voters. • Streamlined and consistent experience for voter statewide. Uniformed ballot design. • Remote accessible voting. • Good usability. Easy to use for all users. • Revisit county websites on SharePoint. <p><u>Technical needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible and sustainable: Ability to accommodate fast shifts in technology (shorter life cycles). 	<p><u>Policy roadblocks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutes <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Legislatures b. County commissioners • Single address for VR and DOL purposes (information should flows both ways). <p><u>Administrative and Financial roadblocks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding and cost. Everyone Counts and Democracy Live cost \$1.10 per vote. • Service level agreement. • Changes to procedures. • Timing: Planning now but not implementing until 2017. • Need for more technical staff to support new system. <p><u>Usability roadblocks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finding a customized solution for the whole state. <p><u>Technical roadblocks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a single point of failure. • Cloud hosting- security: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Longevity of the hosting company. • Technical changes that could slow processing and results. • Finding a vendor to create our perfect system. • Disposability of new technology. • Vendor dependability. • Strengths/weaknesses of different vendors. • VRDB data security levels. 	<p><u>Policy solutions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a centralized approached. • Identify roles and responsibilities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. State/county • Maintain efficiencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ streets maintained at county level ▪ local candidates ▪ mapping • Modernize motor voter processes. <p><u>Administrative and Financial roadblocks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider phasing out/removing the USPS from the delivery process. <p><u>Technical solutions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install one fully integrated VR system: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. State VRDB b. County EMS c. Candidate info/elected d. Petitions • Use one tabulation system • Establish funding: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Fees b. Blended funding (jurisdiction/county/state) • Gain economies of scale • Create a certification model <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Statewide solution might provide impetus to certify and keep certification process up to date.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redundancy and quality control. Don't create a single point of failure. Resiliency to catastrophe-decentralization. • Secure: Have in place checks and balances • Options for using features from compatible vendors. • Read and write capabilities to enable/disable in house development. • Systems (VR/EMS and Tabulation) must interact • Integrate systems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. OLVR and candidate filling. • Integrate, share, synchronize and standardize data seamlessly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. County to county transfers. b. Minimize/eliminate spreadsheets. c. Voter, jurisdiction and election data. d. GIS integration. e. ERIC at the national level. • Configurability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A la carte options. b. Configurability of reporting (turn on/off features where applicable). • Platform agnostic-mobile device compatibility. <p><u>Voter Registration/ County EMS specific needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capability of pre-registering, holding underage registrants, and same-day registration. • Driver license scanning- instant registration (capture and compare signature). <p><u>Tabulation/Voting System specific needs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering/issuing, receiving, processing ballots electronically. • Voting system that can adapt to electronically transmitted votes. • Automated signature verification. • Tabulation-isolation from web. • Unified reporting system. • Reporting for public verification. • Citizen verifiability- non traceable serial number/tear-off stub. • Alternate identifying techniques (not signatures). • Less duplication. <p><u>Online ballot delivery</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MyBallot type electronic balloting system or license with vendor. • More accessible for voters leaving with a disability. • Ensure ballot order matches county's ballot. 		
---	--	--