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Executive Summary

The essential challenge facing the Marion County Election Board in the coming months is the expiration of critical long-term software and vendor contracts at the end of 2014. Resolving this challenge must also involve careful consideration of the Election Board’s aging current IT infrastructure and voting machines. The Board’s two options are to (1) attempt to extend the current contracts and continue with the current, aging system for as long as the system remains viable and vendors continue to support it; or (2) procure a new, updated voting system in 2014. Notwithstanding the Election Board’s ultimate choice in 2014, the Board will undeniably have to purchase a new voting system at some point in the future. As such, the second and certainly more nebulous question facing the Election Board is “what should future voting in Marion County be like?”

The 18-members of the Marion County Voter Experience Project representing three political parties, community organizations, elected officials and City-County partners met for six sessions over a period of three months to better understand election administration and share their perspectives about how to move the county forward with respect to voting on Election Day.

The five most important themes emerging from the Study Group sessions follow.

- Voting should be accessible and convenient.
- A new system must be cost effective (both short- and long-term).
- Technology should be used to improve the process without setting it back in unintended ways.
- The overall voting process should be fundamentally fair and nondiscriminatory.
- The public must have confidence in the system.

The Study Group’s feedback is being provided to inform the Marion County Election Board of our discussion topics and should not be considered as recommendations. As the administrative and governing body, the bi-partisan Election Board will make any definitive choices and decisions.

Mission Statement

Mission: To present a well informed, fully deliberated report identifying the cost and benefits of Marion County’s future voting needs, and to present our findings to the Election Board.

Report Format

The 18-members of the Voter Experience Project were presented information, guided in discussion and asked to share their feedback for improving voter experience through new voting technology and systems. The information in this report will aid the three members of the bi-partisan Marion County Election Board in making a decision about purchasing new voting equipment or otherwise changing the way elections are conducted. This report should not be viewed as a recommendation for a specific type of voting equipment; rather, it is the perspective of the study group and other members of our community and should be considered when adopting new policy or evaluating potential new voting systems.
Introduction and Background

Marion County’s fleet of aging voting equipment is nearing the end of its useful life. Though the current system continues to be maintained and serviced and remains in working order, replacement parts are becoming increasingly difficult to secure as the older technology is retired. Additionally, current software contracts expire in 2014 and it is unclear whether current systems will continue to be supported by the vendor or certified by the State of Indiana.

Before purchasing any new voting system, the Marion County Election Board must first determine the type of voting experience residents want in order to make the most responsible fiscal decision. Indiana law permits two main types of voting – precinct-based and vote center. The opportunity to combine the best ideas of both methods and develop a hybrid plan that is consistent with state law is a third option. Each approach requires different voting technology; however, before an investment is made, a thorough vetting of the future voting needs of Marion County must be conducted.

VEP Study Group Membership

Marion County’s Voter Experience Project included 18 representatives from the following organizations.

- Four members appointed by the Marion County Democratic Party (must include at least one veteran poll worker)
- Four members appointed by the Marion County Republican Party (must include at least one veteran poll worker)
- One member appointed by the Marion County Libertarian Party
- Co-Directors of the Marion County Board of Voter Registration
- One Democratic City-County Councillor
- One Republican City-County Councillor
- One member appointed by the Marion County Office of Finance and Management
- One member appointed by the Marion County Information Technology Board
- One member appointed by the Greater Indianapolis NAACP
- One member appointed by the League of Women Voters of Indianapolis
- One member appointed by the Central Indiana Council on Aging

Ball State University’s Bowen Center on Public Affairs provided expert technical advice on a variety of topics including representing the disability perspective. Advisors included Dr. Raymond Scheele, Dr. Joseph Losco, Dr. Jay Bagga, attorney Gregory Fehribach and advocate Susan Sizemore.
Rules of Conduct

The following rules of conduct were adopted at the March 27, 2013 organizational meeting.

Group Communication

- Communication with members will be by email and/or phone.
- Contact information for staff and group members will be provided once compiled.
- Questions and/or suggestions to staff between meetings are encouraged; answers will be provided to entire group without attribution to questioner.
- Formal communication on behalf of the Study Group by and between the Study Group and other entities, including the media, will be conducted by the Chair or her proxy.

Meeting Format

- County Clerk Beth White shall serve as Chair of the Study Group and will convene meetings and conduct business of meeting; the Chair shall have the ability to appoint a proxy and vote on matters at her discretion.
- Agendas and presentations will be provided prior to meetings, if possible.

Member Decorum and Attendance

- Attendance of Study Group members is mandatory.
- Proxy appointment and participation on an emergency basis is permissible on a meeting-by-meeting basis; notification of a proxy appointment for a particular meeting must be sent to the Chair via email prior to scheduled beginning of the meeting.
- After a meeting of the Study Group has been called to order, a member thereof shall remain in attendance until adjournment unless excused by the Chair. Early excusal from a meeting should be addressed and obtained prior to the meeting to the greatest extent possible under the circumstances.
- Study Group members shall participate fully, cooperatively, courteously, respectfully and constructively to achieve the purposes, objectives, and mission of the Study Group as provided by the Marion County Election Board.
- To the greatest extent possible, Study Group members are to maintain an open mind, a receptive disposition and not reach conclusions until the end of the process.
- Comments and/or questions of Study Group members and/or the public (when provided according to these rules) shall be relevant and germane to topics raised in current meeting, prior meetings, and/or in communications to Study Group members.
- Members shall speak and act one-at-a-time in a cordial and professional manner when addressing each other, the meeting facilitator, the Chair, staff, contractors, and guest speakers.
- If any member of the Study Group, in speaking or otherwise, transgresses the rules of the Study Group, the Chair shall, or any member may, call such member to order, in which case such member shall immediately surrender the floor. The determination to call such member to order may be appealed to the members of the Study Group present and (unless permitted on motion of another member to explain) the Study Group shall decide the appeal by majority vote without debate. If the appeal decision is in favor of the member called to order, such member shall be at liberty to proceed, but not otherwise.
• After a meeting of the Study Group has been called to order, members must place their cell phones on silent or vibrate and must temporarily exit the meeting room to answer calls or respond to email. Permission of the Chair to exit the meeting room is not necessary for this purpose.
• Votes and decisions will be made by a majority vote of Study Group members present determined by a show of hands.
• Members must disclose any possible conflicts of interest via email to the Chair by the first meeting of the Study Group, including any financial or familial relationship to potential election service providers, vendors, or contractors, and/or to any person or firm with whom the Marion County Election Board has an ongoing financial, employment, or contractual relationship.

Public Access
• Any member of the public present at a meeting of the Study Group shall be permitted to submit written questions and/or comments to the Study Group on index cards provided by staff for this purpose; answers shall be provided to written questions if time permits within the course of the meeting, or otherwise within a reasonable time following the meeting.
• Timing of public comments within a Study Group meeting shall be determined by the Chair.
• Due to limited time available for meetings, individual public comments and questions shall be limited to 3 minutes in duration as enforced by the Chair.

Final Report
• The Study Group shall approve by majority vote a final report containing the findings of the Study Group, including reported findings as to areas of consensus and areas of difference along with explanations of underlying reasons for differences of opinion.
• Once approved, the report shall be submitted to the Marion County Election Board.
• Once the approved report is submitted to the Election Board, individual or subsets of members who wish to do so may submit minority reports.
Voting in Marion County, Indiana in the HAVA Era

Through the November 2000 presidential election, Marion County – like many jurisdictions – used lever machines at its precincts to tally results of each race. Lever machine technology dates back to the late 19th century and was widely used until the 1960s when punch-card technology was favored due to lower cost. The 2000 presidential election turned election administration on its head with concerns about the effectiveness of punch card voting systems and low-tech lever machines. Congress responded to those concerns and passed the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) in 2002. This legislation pushed for the use of better technology to tabulate and store ballots cast each election.

Part of the HAVA movement included financial support to the states to purchase new voting systems. Marion County used federal HAVA funds to purchase the ES&S M100 optical scan machine, which uses paper ballot cards completed by the voter and read by the machine to tally results. The M100 was first used in the 2003 primary election.

In 2006, HAVA was revised to require jurisdictions to provide a confidential voting experience for all voters, especially those with a disability. Because the M100 only offered paper ballot cards that are difficult for some voters with disabilities to use, the county purchased additional ES&S iVotronic touch screen machines. This type of direct recording electronic allows a voter to touch the screen or use navigational buttons to mark a virtual ballot. Another feature is the audio-ballot where a voter with a visual disability can ‘listen’ to their ballot and make their selections using Braille-enabled buttons. An image of the virtual ballot is stored on the equipment and on the Personalized Electronic Ballot (PEB), a hand-held device with memory to store ballot styles specific to the precinct and store voted ballots.

The decision was made to place one M100 at every precinct and at least one iVotronic at every polling location to comply with HAVA requirements. A system was devised to ‘marry’ the iVotronic to the M100 through a PEB reader. The reader is a small piece of equipment where the PEB is inserted into the base and then the device is connected to the M100 scanner via printer cable. This connection transmits the information from the PEB to the scanner to collate results. Marion County, Indiana is the only jurisdiction in the United States to use the PEB reader in this manner. The iVotronic and M100 pairing was first used in the 2006 general election.

In December 2007, Marion County consolidated precincts from 917 to 590, resulting in fewer poll workers, more efficient use of voting systems, and streamlined operations. Today, Marion County has 600 precincts and continues to have precinct-based voting where voters go to their home precinct on Election Day to cast their ballot. Other early voting options exist including voting by mail, in-person in the Clerk’s Office and by a bi-partisan traveling board. Marion County opened additional early voting locations, called satellite sites, in the 2008 and the 2009 elections. Subsequently, satellite sites have not been opened because statute requires a unanimous agreement among Election Board members.

More than ten years after HAVA was passed and new voting systems adopted, Marion County finds itself in a position to be proactive to better meet the needs of voters with the purchase of a new voting system. To help inform the process, the bi-partisan Election Board launched the Voter Experience Project in February 2013. The first phase of the project brings together constituent groups and political representatives to consider many facets of local election administration and provide their input to improve the process. The second phase will be a series of public meetings to share the study group’s input and solicit input from all Marion County residents.
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
Module 1: Election Fundamentals

Indiana’s Election Cycle
In Indiana, elections are administered by county Election Boards on a four-year cycle: non-presidential federal election, municipal election, presidential federal election and an ‘off-year’ where no elections are conducted unless a special election is called. Each state determines the date of its primary election where the two major political parties nominate their candidates for November’s general election. In Indiana, the primary election is held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in May. November’s general election is held on the same date throughout the United States – the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

In federal election cycles, offices like U.S. House of Representatives and Senate may be on the ballot as well as state offices like Governor, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Treasurer, Auditor and Attorney General (to name a few). Countywide, township and school board officials are also elected in the federal cycles. Between the non-presidential federal election and presidential election, Indiana holds municipal elections to allow local jurisdictions to determine their office holders. In Marion County municipal elections, voters will find Mayor of Indianapolis (and if living in an excluded city, mayor of Southport, Lawrence or Beech Grove), City-County Council, town councils, local Clerk-Treasurers, etc.

Other elections, such as referenda and/or other “special elections” may be scheduled:
- during the off year election,
- at the same time and on the same ballot as statutorily scheduled elections, or
- at other times during election years.

Marion County has experienced each of these in its recent past. For example, in March 2008, the Marion County Election Board administered a “special election” to replace Congresswoman Julia Carson who passed away in office. The Board also administered the 2008 Presidential Primary in May and 2008 Presidential Election in November, totaling three (3) elections in one year. In 2009 – an “off year,” the Board administered a countywide special election to determine a public question relating to the financing of a new county hospital by referendum. Some school board’s also placed a referendum question on ballots specific to their township.

Referendum elections occur when state statutes provide for the determination of public questions by the electorate of a particular jurisdiction. Some referenda are statewide, such as the ratification of proposed amendments to the Indiana Constitution. Others are based on smaller elections and/or judicial districts. All referenda legally held in Indiana must be authorized and controlled by state statute.

Types of Elections
There are two types of elections in a given scheduled election year: primary and general. Primary elections are held to permit the two major political parties (Democrat and Republican) to select their respective candidates to run in the general election later that year. Primary elections in Indiana are held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in May. Candidates that receive the most votes in a primary election become the candidates that are nominated to run from the respective party in the general election. Only “members” (as determined by statute) of each political party may participate and vote in a primary election. However, Indiana has a type of “open” primary where voters do not declare party affiliation when registering to vote but must choose a partisan ballot (Democrat or Republican) to vote in a primary election. Hoosier voters cannot vote in both
parties’ primaries; they must choose one or the other. A recent change in state law moved school board elections to November’s general election and non-partisan ballots are only available in a primary election if a referendum election is called.

General elections are held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November. Voters at the general election select the office holders for the next term specific to each office on the ballot. Candidates in the general election are selected and placed on the ballot based on primary results, nomination by their party or by petition as prescribed by statute. Write-in candidates are also permitted under Indiana law but must be certified by the Indiana Election Division or county Election Board.

**Election Funding**

Indiana elections are generally funded by counties. In Marion County, the Marion County Election Board administers elections using funds appropriated to the Election Board from the Marion County General Fund by the City-County Council. For large capital expenses and purchases (such as the purchase of voting machines), a bond is often sold to finance the purchase over time. For referendum elections scheduled at times during which there is not a regularly scheduled election, the public entity proposing and sponsoring the referendum must pay for the election expenses for that particular election.

In 2002, the federal government provided funding to states through the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) to assist upgrading election equipment. In Indiana, there is local control of elections and respective counties independently select the appropriate voting system for their county. HAVA funds were administered and distributed to counties by the Indiana Secretary of State. Marion County used the HAVA funds it received to purchase the voting system and software licenses that the county has today and will have through at least the end of 2014.

More specifically, the county sold a bond to finance the purchase of the new voting system and licenses and the HAVA funds distributed to Marion County were used to repay part of that bond. Part of the HAVA funds also went toward the election services package that the county purchased with its system and software in 2002. However, that service package expired in 2009 and the Election Board selected a new election service provider for elections through the end of 2014.

The cost of the 2002 voting system follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting Equipment &amp; Accessories</td>
<td>$ 6,916,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Support Services</td>
<td>$ 2,698,638.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Agreement</td>
<td>$ 746,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES&amp;S Software License Fees</td>
<td>$ 102,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Items</td>
<td>$ 21,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 10,484,818.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Agencies with a Role in Marion County Election Administration

Several agencies play a role in administering elections in Marion County and are listed below.

- **Marion County Election Board (MCEB)**
  This administrative body has three members, one appointed by each of the two major political parties and the elected County Clerk who serves ex-officio as the Board’s secretary. The MCEB manages Election Day operations and absentee voting activities. It also supports the local parties’ respective efforts to recruit poll workers. The MCEB trains poll workers, creates and prints ballots, maintains and tests voting equipment and software, and tabulates and certifies election results.

- **Marion County Clerk**
  This countywide elected official is the county’s “Chief Election Officer” and serves as ex-officio member and secretary of the Election Board. In Marion County, the Clerk supervises the Election Board staff, drafts and administers the Election Board budget, attends to education and community outreach regarding elections, and maintains filings, election results, and other records.

- **Marion County Board of Voters Registration**
  This bi-partisan administrative body has two members or “Co-Directors” – one appointed by the Democratic Party chair, the other by the Republican Party chair. Only a few Indiana counties have a separate and independent Voter Registration Board. In most counties the voter registration services are under the authority and responsibility of the County Clerk. The Voter Registration Board accepts and maintains county voter registration records within the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS). The Voter Registration Board also builds a “precinct key” based on election district legislation and maps to administratively assign voters within the precincts and election districts in which voters reside. The Election Board uses this key to build and print ballots for each precinct’s voters. The Voter Registration Board also prints poll books for Election Day use.

- **County Executive**
  Because Marion County operates as a consolidated city-county under the UniGov statute state law defines the county executive as the Mayor of Indianapolis. (In Indiana’s other 91 counties, County Commissioners serve as the county executive.) The Mayor selects and contracts with precinct polling locations to provide accessible facilities for voting on Election Day. The Mayor also draws precinct boundaries, assuming approval by the Indiana Election Commission.

**Precincts: The Building Blocks of an Election**

Geographically, precincts are areas drawn on a map that cover approximately 2-5 city blocks and include roughly 1,200 registered voters. All voters in Marion County reside in a precinct. Precincts are drawn by the Indianapolis Mayor and generally approved by the bi-partisan Indiana Election Commission. Based on the maps from the Mayor, the Board of Voter Registration assigns voters residing within the boundaries of a precinct to that precinct within the Statewide Voter Registration System.

All election districts and government jurisdictions are made up of geographically contiguous precincts. Some smaller local districts (i.e. township board districts) have boundaries that do not match with precinct boundaries and ‘split’ a precinct into smaller election districts, meaning voters living in the same precinct may vote for
different candidates in one or more races depending on the way maps were drawn. Most split precincts are caused by school board districts; state law does not permit split precincts for federal, state and countywide election districts.

In the last five years, Marion County has operated under three sets of precinct maps. For several decades, Marion County had 917 precincts. On December 31, 2007, the Mayor of Indianapolis signed an order reducing the number of precincts to 590. The consolidation of precincts is outlined in state law requiring a public hearing and approval by the bi-partisan Indiana Election Commission. In 2011, state law permitted county executives to adjust precinct maps as a result of the federal census. The Mayor adopted a new set of precinct maps increasing the number of precincts from 590 to 600 beginning January 1, 2012, and the county continues to operate under these maps.

In Marion County, voters live in a ward and precinct. There are 32-numbered wards, which represent the geographical boundaries of the old city limits (i.e. those defining the city and county prior to UniGov). For voters living outside of the old city limits, their township name is their ‘ward.’ For example, 18-001 indicates a voter lives in the 18th ward, first precinct while WR-011 means a voter lives in Warren Township in precinct 11.

**Building Ballots**
There are three types of permitted ballots in Indiana: ballot cards, paper ballots, and DRE (Direct Recording Electronic) ballots. Ballot cards are paper ballots on which voters mark their ballots using ink and an optical scan machine reads, counts and records the votes electronically. Paper ballots are ballots on which voters mark votes in ink and votes are hand-counted. DRE ballots are displayed and exist in electronic form only. Voters using DRE machines navigate the electronic voting software using a computer and mark their selections by touch screens, buttons, etc. The computer then records and tabulates the voter’s selections electronically.

Before Election Day, ballots must be created for each precinct. The Election Board drafts ballots for each precinct based on how the Voter Registration Board defines each precinct in the “Precinct Key.” The “Precinct Key” is a document that lists - by precinct - all the different election districts in which each precinct sits – from U.S. Congressional District down to township board district. The precinct key determines which races will appear on a given precinct’s ballot in a particular election according to the Indiana Election Code. After candidates are certified by either the Indiana Election Division or the county Election Board, the Election Board inputs the names of the certified candidates on the ballot for each appropriate race. Public questions are also placed on the ballot if authorized. The order of the races and ballot position of candidates in each race is prescribed in Indiana law.

For automated voting systems (not hand-counted ballots), there are two ways to “code” an election: by style or by precinct. Many precincts in a particular election may have identical races and candidates. In such circumstances, the Election Board may decide to only create a particular “style” of ballot and assign each appropriate precinct to utilize that particular “style” ballot. This is known as coding “by style.” Using this method, there are fewer “styles” than the total number of precincts, which can marginally reduce the number of ballot cards to be printed. Machines are programmed to read/recording votes according to style, as opposed to reading/recording solely by precinct. Coding “by style” permits flexibility by permitting one precinct to utilize ballots printed for another precinct on an emergency basis if the former precinct runs out of ballots. Coding “by precinct” is the ballot creation method in which ballots and scanning/recording machines are programmed
individually for each precinct. Machines cannot read ballots from another precinct, even if the ballots of the other precinct are identical.

Hand-counted paper ballots must be printed either before Election Day or on-demand. If printed before Election Day, ballots are sorted and secured by precinct and picked up by the Inspector for use at the polls. On-demand means a printer is available on-site for poll workers to print ballots for voters after they are processed into the pollbook. Electronic (DRE) ballots do not require any printed materials (other than for security testing and printing results), because ballots are displayed, voted, and stored electronically.

**The Role of Poll Workers**
Poll workers manage and control all Election Day voting at polling locations in Marion County. They welcome and process voters in the poll book and select the correct ballot for the individual. Poll workers initiate and shutdown the voting equipment (and assist in its operation if necessary). They enforce election laws to protect voters and prevent fraud. Poll workers also, historically, have processed absentee votes at the precinct. Generally, there are three types of poll workers: inspectors, judges, and clerks. There are also “watchers” and “challengers” who are appointed by local political parties. Watchers are permitted to watch voting and the poll workers’ activities and inspect voting materials (except a voter’s ballot). Challengers may challenge voters based on Indiana law under the penalties of perjury if they have personal knowledge of an election violation.

**Provisional Ballots**
Provisional ballots are a “ballot of last resort” to allow the Election Board to review challenges or other problems like a voter not being registered to vote or not having appropriate ID under Indiana law. If it’s determined a provisional ballot is needed, poll workers select the correct ballot style for the voter and place a “provisional ballot” sticker on it. The voter and challenger or poll worker completes the affidavit on the ballot security envelope and then the voter is permitted to vote. Instead of placing the ballot into the voting equipment, the voter comes back to the poll workers and his/her ballot is secured inside the envelope. The voter signs the outside of the security envelope as well.

After Election Day, individuals voting provisionally due to ID issues can bring valid ID to the Election Board by noon, ten days after the election. All other provisional ballot envelopes are reviewed by staff and presented to the bi-partisan Board, who makes the determination whether or not to count each ballot. Those ballots found to be valid under Indiana law are then read by the voting equipment and results are updated in each precinct before certification to the Indiana Election Division.

**Voter Registration Requirements**
Indiana voter registration requirements are as follows.
- Voters must be a citizen of the United States.
- Voters must be 18 years old on or before the date of the general election.
- Voters must reside in their voting precinct for 30 day prior to Election Day.
- Voters cannot currently be serving a prison sentence.

There were 640,675 registered voters in Marion County as of the date of the 2012 Presidential Election. Registered voters are classified in the Statewide Voter Registration System as either “active” or “inactive.” An active voter has registered or voted in at least one election during the preceding four years or have responded in writing to an address confirmation notice sent to them by voter registration officials. An inactive voter is a
registered voter who has not registered or voted in at least one election in the past four years and did not respond within 30 days to an address confirmation card sent by voter registration officials. Both types of voters appear on a precinct’s poll book on Election Day. State law outlines specific procedures necessary to remove “inactive” voters from voter rolls.

**Indiana Voting Methods**

**Absentee Voting:** In Indiana, all voting occurring before Election Day is characterized “absentee voting.” There are three potential general methods for absentee voting: by mail, by traveling absentee board, or early in-person voting. In all forms, a voter must first submit an application requesting to vote absentee. Applications are not kept on file for more than one election; the voter must apply to vote absentee in each election.

To **vote by mail,** the voter must complete and sign an application, marking one of the state-authorized reasons for voting by mail. Applications must be received by the state deadline, which is no later than 11:59 p.m. eight days before Election Day (postmarks do not count – application must be in the office by the deadline.) Once received, the Election Board staff processes the application and if approved, sends the applicant a ballot through the mail. On or before Election Day, the voter must fill out his/her ballot and return it in the postage-paid security envelope provided by the Board. The voter must also sign the outside of the envelope in the designated area before returning it.

To vote by **traveling board,** the voter submits an application requesting a bi-partisan team to bring a ballot to his or her home or other similar facility (nursing home, hospital) and provide assistance, if requested. This option only exists for voters with disabilities who believe their polling location is inaccessible or for voters confined to their home due to illness or injury. State law only permits traveling boards to operate for 12 days before an election. However, applications for the service can be received up to 11:59 a.m. the day before Election Day. If the application is approved by staff, both the Board and voter must mutually agree to an appointment time during this window.

**Early voting in-person** occurs 28-days before an election in the Clerk’s Office. (Indiana law changed in 2013 to reduce early voting in the state from 29-days to 28.) Voters do not need a reason to vote early, but they do need to present proper identification under Indiana law. Local Election Boards can open additional early voting sites, known as “satellite” locations, by unanimous vote. Early voting ends at noon on the Monday immediately before Election Day.

All absentee ballots are secured in envelopes bearing the voter’s signature and paired with the corresponding application. Staff collates them by precinct in preparation for counting them on Election Day. There are two methods for counting absentee ballots: a precinct count or a central count. State law allows local Election Boards to determine the best method for counting absentee ballots; however, state law changed in 2013. The law now requires only Marion County to centrally count its absentee ballots. (Traditionally the county has opted to vote absentees at the precinct for efficiency reasons.) This new requirement can be overridden if the Marion County Election Board unanimously passes a resolution to permit a precinct count of absentee ballots.

A precinct count requires bi-partisan commissioner teams to deliver each precinct’s absentee ballots to the polling location. Poll workers sign off on the list and receive the ballots for processing. When there is opportunity, poll workers review the signature on the application and ballot to determine validity, process valid
absentee voters into the poll book, separate the ballot from the security envelope and feed the ballots into the precinct’s voting machine. As a result, absentee ballot totals are part of the precinct’s overall results and cannot be parsed out.

A central count of absentee requires bi-partisan couriers to deliver lists of absentee voters to each precinct. The voters on the list are processed into the precinct’s poll book by the poll workers when they have opportunity to do so. Courier teams must leave the precinct with the processed list and return to the central site with the information. Bi-partisan commissioner teams (counters) can then count the absentee ballots for each precinct that has a list returned. These additional commissioner teams perform the same duties as the poll workers do under the precinct count scenario. Because the ballots are tallied on separate electronic media, it is possible to parse absentee voting information out of the precinct totals.

**Election Day Voting:** For Election Day voters, each county must decide whether to use one of two methods for voting: (1) at voting locations specifically assigned for each voting precinct, or (2) at Vote Centers where voters may vote regardless of the location of their specific precinct. Regardless of the method, the hours the polls are open in Indiana are consistent throughout the state: 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. local prevailing time.

The **traditional precinct-based Election Day voting model** is the default model for voting in Indiana. Precinct polling locations are designated by the county executive (i.e. the Mayor of Indianapolis) at locations within or near the geographical boundaries of the precinct in which a voter resides. In Marion County, multiple precincts often are assigned to a single polling location. Polling locations must be certified by the Mayor to the Election Board at least 29 days prior to Election Day. Notice must be published as to the location of each precinct at least 10 days prior to Election Day. Polling locations are subject to change each election based on the determination of the Mayor.

There are five traditional poll workers assigned for each precinct in a precinct-based voting model: (1) Democratic appointed Judge; (2) Republican appointed Judge; (3) Democratic appointed poll clerk; (4) Republican appointed poll clerk; and (5) an Inspector appointed by the local Democratic or Republican party according to state law. Currently, the Marion County Democratic Party selects the Inspectors in Marion County. The Election Board assists the political parties to recruit and assign poll workers as needed, with particular priority given to the recruitment and assignment of Inspectors. Political parties must appoint poll workers 21 days prior to Election Day.

For precinct-based voting, the county may use either a precinct count or central count when counting absentee ballots as described above. Absentee ballots in a precinct count are received up to the point of the board’s final attempt to deliver absentee ballots to precincts, usually just before 6:00 p.m. The Marion County Election Board in recent years has sought and received a court order to be able to count absentee ballots that were unable to be delivered to their particular precincts before the close of the polls through no fault of the voter. To be counted at a central count, all absentee ballots must be received by the Election Board before noon on Election Day.

This model requires a poll book that has historically been printed one per precinct prior to Election Day and delivered to the precinct with other election materials. Recently, the Indiana legislature has approved electronic poll books that would replace printed poll books with computer-based poll books and software. Precinct-based voting uses several types of voting machines as well. In Marion County, each precinct has one optical scan ballot reader and each polling location has at least one Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) that has ballots programmed for each of the precincts located at the site. Several weeks prior to each election, each election machine and the entire election
programming and reporting system is exhaustively tested during what is known as the Logic and Accuracy testing (L&A testing). Following L&A testing and at least 14 days before Election Day, the Election Board must conduct a public test of its voting equipment according to statute.

Marion County voters can choose to vote on either the DRE machine or the printed paper ballot cards. For the electronic ballots, nothing is printed. Instead, ballots are programmed and stored on a Personalized Electronic Ballot (PEB) cartridge used to initiate and store a particular voted ballot electronically. Ballot cards used by Marion County are pre-printed and coded by style or by precinct (as described above). Pre-printed ballots are sorted and wrapped in stacks of 50 for ease of counting and distribution.

Precinct-based voting procedures are outlined in state law and familiar to voters throughout the state, including Marion County. Voters must go to the correct precinct polling location near their residence in order to vote on Election Day. Voters may not vote at precincts or locations other than their own “home” precinct. Once arriving at their assigned precinct polling location, voters present valid identification and poll workers process the voters into the poll book. The voter signs the poll book in the designated area and is handed the correct ballot or a card for the voter to hand the judge to initiate the DRE. (Most voters opt for ballot cards in Marion County; about 1,000 ballots are cast in each election on the DRE.) The voter completes the ballot and it is tabulated on the precinct’s voting system.

After the polls close on Election Day, the results from the DRE are transmitted to the optical scan machine and combined results are printed. Poll workers perform a variety of duties including securing voted ballots, completing a ballot accounting certificate, removing electronic media from the voting systems, and cleaning up the polling site. The materials are delivered by the poll workers to a location specified by the Election Board. The Board then secures the materials in a vault.

The Vote Center model is a recently introduced alternative to precinct-based voting that has been approved for use by counties throughout Indiana. The primary difference between precinct-based and Vote Center voting is where a person votes on Election Day. Precinct-based voting requires the individual to go to his or her home precinct; vote centers permit a voter to go to any site in the county. If the local Election Board unanimously agrees to a Vote Center plan, state law requires at least one Vote Center for every 10,000 active voters. The location and administration (including the identity and appointment of poll workers) for each Vote Center must be described in a Vote Center plan that is approved by unanimous vote of the county Election Board.

Absentee voting is much the same in a Vote Center model as in a precinct-based model. However, in a Vote Center model, there must be at least one “satellite” early voting location (in addition to the office of the County Clerk) that is also one of the agreed upon Vote Center locations. Additionally, in a Vote Center model all absentees must be counted at a central location, instead of at precincts or Vote Centers.

The technology needs for a Vote Center model are quite different from the needs of the precinct-based model currently used in Marion County. While other voting systems are available on the market, Marion County’s current fleet of voting machines and equipment is not compatible with using a Vote Center model. Though the county’s current Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) machines are capable of storing and recording the ballot styles for the county’s 600 precincts, the county does not own enough machines to support the minimum number of Vote Centers
needed. Using 2012 presidential election registration totals, Marion County would need a minimum of 64 vote centers.

The county’s current optical scan reader can safely store and record the results of one precinct, which means each Vote Center would need at least 600 scanners – not a practical solution. Additionally, pre-printing ballots would be difficult since the Board could not predict which center a voter will go. Remember, Vote Centers do not get rid of precincts! Voters must still vote for those candidates representing their precinct as defined in legislation or maps. If paper ballot cards are the preferred voting method, the county may need to explore printing ballots on demand and it does not currently own enough equipment to support Vote Centers.

Vote Centers also require the use of an electronic poll book or ePollbook. The ePollbook can be updated throughout the entire network in real-time to prevent individuals from voting more than once. Clearly, a paper poll book would not be able to accomplish this requirement. Like a paper poll book, a voter must “sign” the ePollbook either electronically or by signing a paper “log book” to track and compare a voter’s signature with that reflected in the voter registration record (i.e. poll book).

Other differences and challenges between precinct-based and Vote Center based models of voting may exist with respect to closing polls and recounts depending on the Vote Center Plan adopted by a county Election Board. The Plan can address poll closing procedures, but it must involve the collation of ballots and election materials on a precinct-by-precinct basis at some point after the polls close and (at the very least) before results are certified and materials are secured for purposes of recounts. This collation process would be quite difficult and cause significant delays using a ballot-card system in Marion County, as this would require potentially thousands of pieces of paper to be collated into 600 separate groupings at each of at least 60+ Vote Centers across Marion County. Using a purely electronic DRE system would mitigate these challenges, but would eliminate the ability during a recount to compare the reported electronic results with an independent paper-based record of votes, namely the ballot card itself.

As mentioned above, the use of a Vote Center model is dependent upon the county Election Board’s unanimous approval of a Vote Center Plan. State law permits a good deal of flexibility (and ambiguity) as to the particular voting procedures and personnel each county may use to execute its version of the Vote Center model. There are some requirements, however. The voting procedures described in the Vote Center Plan must comply –to the greatest extent possible – with the requirements of the Indiana Election Code. The Plan must be vetted at a public meeting. The county executive and legislative bodies must also pass separate resolutions designating the county as a Vote Center county. The Plan may not be amended or changed (including the location of Vote Centers) without unanimous vote of the Election Board.

Data
The Study Group was presented with graphs and data provided in Appendix A that compares the use of precinct-based and Vote Center models in jurisdictions of different sizes in the U.S. and Indiana. Among urban cities of similar size and number of registered voters as Indianapolis, Austin, Texas is the only one currently using a vote center model. The largest cities in the country use precinct-based voting models. Among Indiana counties, Marion County is unique in size and urban density. Marion County comprises 15% of all registered voters Indiana, and has nearly the same number of registered voters as the next four most populated Indiana counties combined. If one combined all the registered voters of all 8 counties in Indiana that have utilized Vote Centers, it would still be significantly less than the number of registered voters in Marion County alone.
Module 2: Poll Workers & General Procedures

During Module 2, the Voter Experience Project Study Group was presented with greater detail on the personnel and administrative needs of absentee voting for Marion County currently as well as related topics to consider in evaluating the potential use of Vote Centers in Marion County.

Election Day Voting Administration

Marion County’s Election Day operations involve the coordinated efforts of several types of personnel, including (1) poll workers, (2) equipment transportation vendors, (3) supply runners, (4) machine technicians, (5) hotline operators, and (6) Election Board members and staff post-election. Marion County’s current procedures are principally relevant to the continuation of a precinct-based voting model. Marion County has little experience or factual basis to understand and evaluate related needs in a Vote Center model, but there are some available information and assumptions to be drawn that are valuable to consider.

Marion County Election Day voting precincts generally employ 5 poll workers appointed by the two major political parties, namely an Inspector, two bi-partisan judges, and two bi-partisan poll clerks. While Clerks and Judges are bi-partisan appointments, Inspector selection is outlined in state law. The political party of the candidate that wins the Secretary of State race in the county (not statewide) appoints the Inspector for the next four years. In the last Secretary of State race, the Democratic candidate won Marion County and as a result, the local Democratic Party appoints the Inspector position through 2014.

The Inspector and the Judges comprise the “Precinct Election Board,” which resolves significant questions or challenges (with input from Election Board training and hotline assistance) by majority vote. Poll clerks are not members of the Precinct Election Board. The Election Board may also adopt a resolution to permit assistant poll clerks to be appointed as needed. Marion County has 600 precincts, which equates to roughly 3,000 poll workers if all precincts are fully staffed. In the 2012 Presidential Election, the Election Board employed and paid more than 2,800 precinct poll workers.

The precinct Inspector manages the precinct. Inspectors receive the longest and most thorough training of all the poll workers. Inspectors pick up and deliver all election supplies (including ballots and poll books) to the precinct on Election Day and make sure the polls are open promptly at 6 a.m. The Inspector manages the precinct and provides assistance to voters and other poll workers. Inspectors also ensure required Election Day procedures are executed, including closing machines, printing results, and returning results/ballots to the Election Board after the polls close.

Precinct judges assist the Inspector and assist voters in the operation of the machine and other procedures upon request. The Judges are also able to check voter IDs. Precinct poll clerks manage the poll book, check voter IDs, obtain and present the appropriate ballot to voters and process absentee ballots upon delivery with assistance from the other poll workers.

In a Vote Center model, poll workers and other personnel (and who appoints them) are designated in the Vote Center Plan that is unanimously approved by the county Election Board. There are no minimum or maximum requirements for the number of Vote Center workers. For example, the 2011 Vote Center Plan in Vanderburgh County, Indiana (Evansville area) called for one Inspector, four bi-partisan Judges, and four bi-partisan poll clerks. Floyd County, Indiana used the same five poll workers as they would if in a precinct-based model. By contrast, the
Vote Center Plan for Tippecanoe County, Indiana (Lafayette area) called for a supervisor, greeters, exit greeters, Check-in Judges, Programming Judges, Provisional Team, and a Hold Back team.

Marion County has historically employed additional staff and volunteers to assist with Election Day operations. Equipment transportation vendors deliver voting machines to polling locations prior to Election Day and track where machines are stored at each location. Supply runners are dispatched from the Election Services Center on Election Day to deliver additional supplies to precincts as needed. At least 25 machine technicians are divided among all polling locations to provide technical assistance to an assigned route of sites.

Hotline operators field calls at the Election Board headquarters to resolve and track questions or problems received from poll workers and voters. Operators use a proprietary database system developed and first implemented in 2007 called “EBIRS” (Election Board Incident Reporting System) to track all issues. The EBIRS system sends tickets to the Board’s dispatch center to deploy mechanics or supplies to precincts. Legal and systemic issues are elevated for attention by Election Board counsel and staff. Operators and staff prioritize situations that might prevent voters from voting, such as the absence of the precinct Inspector and/or the inability of poll workers to gain entrance to a polling location prior to the time polls are supposed to open. The Voter Registration Board also operates a separate hotline operation on Election Day to address registration issues or help voters find their polling location.

Using a Vote Center model, most of these same functionalities will remain necessary. If a particular Vote Center Plan calls for significant consolidation of voters, staff, and equipment, it may be necessary to provide enhanced assistance at each Vote Center rather than dispatching technical, supply and programmatic assistance from regional routes or a central location. Processing voters at a Vote Center would be similar to processing voters in a precinct-based model. The obvious difference would be that any voter can vote at any Vote Center in the county requiring the use of electronic pollbooks to prevent a person from voting more than once.

However, there could be significant differences and potential challenges with closing polls in a Vote Center model in Marion County. Generally, Vote Centers must comply with Indiana Election Code procedures to the greatest extent possible, including reporting and security requirements. Results for each Vote Center should be printed for each precinct that recorded votes at that particular Vote Center. The election system selected to accommodate the Vote Center model should possess that capability. Again, poll workers at Vote Centers would likely need to separate and collate voted ballots in up to 600 stacks—one per precinct. Poll workers would need to seal those collated ballots and deliver them to the Election Board.

Assuming that the collation process occurs at each Vote Center after the polls close, the election certification and provisional ballot processes would likely be very similar to Marion County’s current precinct-based model. The Election Board has ten days after Election Day to receive military and overseas absentee ballots, determine the outcome of provisional votes, and otherwise make preparations to certify election results. In recent years following Election Day, the Election Board has sought and received a court order to process and count absentee ballots that were not delivered to the correct precinct on Election Day through no fault of the voter. This judicial process may not be necessary under a Vote Center or central count model as all absentee ballots must be received by noon to be counted and there is no delivery of ballots to the precinct.

During the ten-day certification process, the Election Board holds a public meeting to determine the validity of provisional ballots cast on Election Day. The volume of provisional ballots varies from election to election, roughly
consistent with election turnout. However, only a fraction (approximately 10% to 15%) of provisional ballots cast is valid and can be counted. The most common reason for not counting a provisional ballot is that voters are not registered to vote in the precinct at which they attempted to vote, meaning they are either not registered at all or registered in another precinct (potentially in another county).

The Election Board’s certification, by statute, also includes a “canvass” of the votes. During this process, bi-partisan teams compare the precinct results printed by the voting machines against the election reports tabulated by and printed from the central election reporting database software. This process verifies the accuracy and consistency of the election results during transmission, and the final result is certified to the Indiana Election Division. If a Vote Center model were to be adopted in Marion County, the canvass process would need to be revised. Staff would need to collate totals tapes for the county’s 600 precincts printed at 64 Vote Centers, the minimum number of sites required using 2012 Voter Registration totals. Potentially, each precinct could have up to 64 totals tapes or one for each vote center.

**Administration of Absentee Processing and Counting on Election Day**

The VEP Study Group met over the course of several months from April to July 2013. During this time, the Indiana legislature enacted new rules controlling how Marion County is to process and count absentee ballots on Election Day. Historically, the Election Board had elected to use a precinct-based counting model in which absentee ballots received by the Election Board were delivered to their respective precincts to be recorded in the precinct poll book and run through the precinct’s optical scan voting machine. New legislation now requires Marion County to abandon this precinct-based process and employ a central count, unless the Election Board unanimously decides otherwise.

Before Election Day, staff inputs all absentee applications into the Statewide Voter Registration System. The SVRS tracks a particular application and ballot through the receipt of the voted ballot from the voter. As such, there is an electronic record of each application and ballot received by the Election Board that can be electronically collated by precinct. As ballots are received by the Board, they are separated and secured by precinct. Prior to Election Day, staff generates from SVRS lists of absentee voters by precinct to verify that the ballot is included in the precinct’s materials.

In a central count of absentees, ballots are processed and counted at one central location. Before counting can begin, couriers or bi-partisan teams must deliver lists of absentee voters to each precinct. Poll workers must process this list of voters into the poll book to prevent absentee voters from voting in their polling place on Election Day. Couriers must leave the precinct with the list of processed absentee voters and return to the central location. Only then can bi-partisan commissioners count absentee ballots from those precincts where the lists have been returned.

The central site commissioner teams employ the same process precinct poll workers perform under a precinct-based model. Teams review the ballots and compare signatures on the secrecy envelope and application for a particular voter. To count the ballots at the central location, counties generally purchase machines (separate from their precinct voting machines) that are capable of inputting and scanning numerous ballot cards from multiple precincts at a time. Once the envelopes and applications are reviewed and processed, absentee ballots can be counted.

Marion County does not currently own high-speed ballot readers capable of tabulating the results of multiple precincts. The voting system purchased in 2002 can only safely tabulate and store results of one precinct. Only a
limited number of the scanners would be available at a central site as the rest of the machines are deployed to the precinct polling locations or held in reserve for mechanics. Using the current equipment, centrally counting each precinct requires one machine to be opened, tapes printed, ballots voted, machines closed, result tapes printed and the precinct-based media removed and inputted into the reporting database. This process would need to be repeated up to 600 times. As a result, it would likely take an extended and unreasonable amount of time and personnel to vote our total number of absentee ballots (19,000 to 90,000 depending on the election) for all 600 voting precincts using just the county’s extra optical scan precinct voting machines. In order to timely report the results of the election, Marion County will likely have to purchase, rent or lease new high-capacity voting equipment.

If a central count is used, Election Day and absentee results will be stored in the reporting database separately. Absentee results would not be included in the precinct results that are printed at the precinct. This will complicate canvassing and will require a process for ultimately joining absentee and in-person Election Day ballots and voting records prior to certification in anticipation of potential recounts.

Technology could be used to mitigate these potential problems. Electronic poll books could ease communication and information sharing between the precincts and central location to avoid the potential for vote fraud and de-emphasize the need for couriers to present lists to the precinct boards since both the precinct staff and central location staff will be working from the same database. Additionally, the Election Board could decide to use all electronic voting for in-person early voting and thus reduce the number of paper ballot cards to be scanned by a voting machine on Election Day. However, the Election Board does not currently own enough electronic voting machines to accommodate in-person early voting and voting on Election Day.

Even if all the technology could be brought to bear, the expediency of counting absentee votes at a central location will be largely determined by the amount of bi-partisan personnel and staff that can be recruited, trained, and maintained throughout the absentee counting. State law requires the two major political parties to appoint absentee commissioners and in the most intense elections, up to 100 commissioners or 50 teams of two are requested by Election Board staff. Absentee administration and counting is labor and document intensive. In 2003, the Election Board attempted a central count of absentees. It took two days to process and count 8,800 ballots by hand.

**Election Administrator’s Administrative Perspective**

Based on the experience of the Election Board and its staff in recent elections, some general themes have become apparent. First, our current voting technology creates a “drag” on poll workers to perform their assigned duties on Election Day. As previously noted, Marion County is the only jurisdiction to “marry” the Direct Recording Electronic device to the optical scan machine through external hardware. This set up and configuration is uniquely difficult and requires an exorbitant amount of training time.

Additionally, machine set-up requires heavy-lifting and deft physical manipulation of the machines. Poll workers must also boot-up the system in a specific way or the equipment will not open properly. This often proves to be too much for poll workers to handle on Election Day (especially older individuals and those with less physical strength and coordination) and poll workers have become completely reliant on back-up technical assistance to set up and initiate voting equipment. This is not an efficient use of personnel. Accordingly, the county’s next voting equipment
needs to be easy to set up, simple to operate, and user-friendly so as to avoid intimidating individuals with limited exposure to technology.

Second, expanded early voting options take pressure off of poll workers and other election support resources by decreasing the number of in-person Election Day voters without diminishing overall turnout. Increasing early voting options also expands opportunities for voters with disabilities to schedule rides and voting assistance with relatives and caregivers to permit a positive voting experience. In addition, early voting permits highly-trained Election Board staff to directly problem-solve and ensure accessible voting accommodations at early voting sites, as opposed to relying on poll workers with limited training and experience.
Module 3: Polling Locations

The selection of polling locations is controlled by the Indiana Election Code. Under the Election Code, each precinct is assigned a specific polling location at which voters of that precinct may vote on Election Day. The County Executive has the responsibility to select accessible polling locations. In Marion County, the County Executive is the Mayor of Indianapolis.

The Mayor must select the sites and submit them to the Marion County Election Board 29 days before a scheduled election. Importantly, the polling location must be inside the geographic boundaries of the precinct, unless a suitable location cannot be found. In this instance, the precinct can be assigned to a polling location within 5 miles of the precinct boundaries or within the same township as the precinct that does not contain an accessible location.

In the 2012 Presidential Election, Marion County used 311 polling locations for 600 precincts since it is possible to co-locate precincts in the same site. Some non-publicly-owned polling locations are compensated $40 per precinct per election. In recent years, the Mayor has gradually reduced the number of polling locations used.

Polling Location Notification

Polling locations are subject to change each election based on the discretion of the Mayor. The locations for each precinct must be published in a local newspaper at least 10 days before the election. Best efforts must be made to notify voters of emergency changes within 3 days of an election, but there is no other obligation to provide actual notice of location changes. However, following recent large-scale location changes, Marion County has attempted to provide actual notice of the changes by sending postcards to voters twice in 2008 and twice in 2012, before the primary and general elections respectively.

The Marion County Election Board provides access to polling location information through its online Voter Information Portal <www.indy.gov/VIP>. The VIP, as it is known, provides each voter in the county the location of where s/he may vote, driving directions, and a map. A phone-based polling place locator is also available at (317) 327-VOTE (8683) before an election.

Polling Place Selection Process

A representative from the Mayor’s Office was invited to describe the selection process to the Voter Experience Project study group members. Amy Waggoner, Deputy Chief of Staff, has led the effort in recent years and described the steps their office takes in picking voting locations. The Mayor’s Office begins by contacting places that have previously been used as polling locations, beginning with schools and fire departments. Depending on the availability of these locations and the lack of any issues with the location in previous elections, these sites are reserved and contracts are sent to them. For an average election, there may be as many as 10 previous locations that may be unavailable each election. Precincts at now unavailable locations are relocated to nearby current polling locations or new polling locations. The list is finalized, presented and approved by the Mayor, and submitted to the Election Board and State Election Division.

There are particular challenges that occur for each election in addition to locations becoming unavailable. Often locations express an unwillingness to continue to serve as a polling site. They cite such reasons as security, damage to facilities, inconvenience of being unable to use space reserved for voting, crowding, and poor communication. Polling locations often lack parking for voters near the entrance to the polls, much less parking for voters with disabilities.
“Off-years,” or the year between regularly scheduled federal elections, provide the opportunity to address some of these issues without the immediacy of scheduling elections. The Mayor’s Office intends to address these challenges through changes to the boilerplate polling location contract terms. The goal of the contract changes is to require locations to provide additional information as to how their facility will be used, including preferred floor plans, designated ingress and egress for voters (especially those with disabilities), designated parking for voters (especially those with disabilities), better and more contact information for Election Day operations, and overflow contingency plans. Better information for poll workers will also facilitate better experience for the facility, voters, and election officials.

**Super Precincts**

In a precinct-based model described above, it is possible for the Election Board to combine precincts to form “super precincts” for Election Day voting. This is not the same as co-locating precincts at a polling location as the Mayor’s Office does. Co-locating precincts at the same site does not eliminate poll worker positions and requires voters to check in at the correct precinct table. In a “super precinct” model, only one set of poll workers is assigned to two or more contiguous precincts and manage all Election Day activities for those precincts. Creating ‘super precincts’ is seldom done in Marion County and requires a unanimous vote of the Election Board.

**Site Selection under a Vote Center Model**

There are fundamental differences between selecting locations for precinct-based elections and for vote center based elections. Indiana law requires there be one Vote Center for every 10,000 active voters in a county. Marion County had 637,820 active voters in 2012. That would require a minimum of 64 Vote Centers that could accommodate a projected maximum of 10,000 voters each. Vote Center locations are selected by unanimous vote of the Election Board as part of its Vote Center Plan.

There are no minimum or maximum requirements with respect to the distances that Vote Center locations may require voters to travel from their residences or their proximity to other sites. For instance, it is possible that Vote Centers could be clustered in one corner of the county. (Though legal to do so, it’s not practical and unlikely an Election Board would unanimously agree to such a plan.) All other requirements of polling locations under Indiana law apply to the greatest extent possible to Vote Centers. The notice requirements for identifying Vote Center locations are the same as for precinct-based polling locations. However, Vote Center locations can change only with the unanimous approval of the Election Board through amending the Vote Center Plan.

**Additional Site Selection Factors**

- **Parking.** Vote Centers and precinct polling locations need enough available (normally vacant) parking spaces to handle a large number of voters coming and going during Election Day. Both require adequate parking spaces near entrances/ exits for voters and poll workers with disabilities. Often voter and poll worker parking is not located near entrances/exits with ramps. Curbs prevent voters and poll workers using scooters or wheelchairs from entering the location.
  
  - **Contract requirements.** The Polling Location Contract that each facility signs with the Mayor of Indianapolis has certain terms that should be, but are not always, followed by polling facilities. For example, the Contract requires that polling locations allow campaign materials to be placed on the facility’s property and allows active campaigning on their property. Private property owners (i.e. churches, social clubs,) do not allow campaigning even on Election Day.
• **School security.** Schools often site “security” as a concern given the number of strangers in a school building on Election Day. However, the Election Board has no evidence of security problems being experienced at any schools in Marion County on Election Day in the last twelve elections.

• **Technology.** Voting equipment has certain technological requirements. Currently, the voting machines require three working electrical outlets for each precinct. Future voting equipment purchased by the county could require internet access of a particular quality and speed.

• **ADA/Churches.** Worship places within a church or other religious facility are not required to comply with the ADA, but non-worship areas must. This could complicate decisions where voting may take place in such places.

**Voter Accessibility**

Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) protects people with disabilities from being excluded from participating or receiving benefits of the services, programs or activities of a public entity OR being subject to discrimination of such entity. Only a “qualified individual with a disability” is protected by Title II. That term is defined as “an individual with a disability who, with or without reasonable modification to rules, policies or practices, the removal of architectural, communication or transportation barriers, or the provision of auxiliary aids and services, meets the essential eligibility requirements for the receipt of services or the participation in programs or activities provided by a public entity.”

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) is a relatively new federal law that created new minimum standards for states to follow with respect to how voters in federal elections vote. Specifically, it implemented new programs and procedures including provisional voting, updated and upgraded voting equipment, statewide voter registration databases, and administrative complaint procedures. HAVA, according to some, was intended to complement the ADA to ensure all voting systems are accessible for people with disabilities.

When HAVA was implemented, each state needed to create a plan and as such, part of Indiana’s HAVA plan includes the formation of local advisory councils composed, in part, of voters with disabilities and elderly voters to advise local officials on polling place accessibility and site selection. These are called Local Advisory Council for Polling Place Accessibility. Indiana’s plan requires county executive to appoint members. You can read Indiana’s full HAVA plan here: [http://www.in.gov/gpcpd/files/CountyAccessguidetovoting.doc](http://www.in.gov/gpcpd/files/CountyAccessguidetovoting.doc)

According to a 2009 US Government Accountability Office Report, approximately 46% of surveyed voting locations present potential challenges for voters using wheelchairs, despite the implementation of accessible voting systems for use once the voter enters the polling location. A majority of these impediments occurred outside or at the entrance of the polling location, particularly in the path from the parking area to the polling location entrance.

To accommodate voters with disabilities it is important to set priorities, such as:

- getting voters in the door; providing access to the areas where you provide voting accessibility;
- providing access to the restroom facilities that are provided for public use; and
- eliminating any physical barriers in the path of voters as they utilize voting facilities.

To get “Voters in the Door,” election officials have to provide an accessible route from the parking lot to the area in the building where voting occurs. It helps to imagine the path a person takes, starting from the sidewalk or parking lot and going where a polling site provides access to voting. The parking lot must have identified spaces for voters and poll workers with disabilities. Parking spaces should also be compliant for van accessible needs.
Sites must have an accessible entrance, meaning that it should be in close proximity to accessible parking. It also means facilities or election officials need to provide compliant ramps or elevators when necessary for access. For example, a site may have accessible parking and room to navigate inside the polling location but lacks a curb cut for a wheelchair user to gain access to a sidewalk. Either the facility owner can make the physical change to their site or election officials can provide a ramp to allow for greater access to the sidewalk.

Once a voter reaches the inside of a location, the location and its fixtures must allow tables, chairs, voting machines and other furniture to be re/arranged to create adequate maneuvering space for voters with wheelchairs, scooters, or other assistive devices. Currently, poll workers are instructed to have at least one wheelchair accessible station for paper ballot users. Current electronic voting equipment (iVotronic) can be removed from its stand and placed on a table or tray.

Accessible equipment must be maintained and in good working order and be available to all voters. If it is not working or not made available by poll workers, the site is not “accessible.” If equipment is temporarily out of service, a polling site should find alternative ways to service voters with disabilities. Poll workers and voters should be instructed to call Election Day hotline immediately if equipment is out of service.

It is important to note that different voters need different solutions. Service animals are allowed inside the polling location (the only two permitted service animals are dogs and small horses). Poll workers should be flexible and courteous, asking a voter how best to accommodate their needs.

If restroom facilities are provided for public use, they should be accessible: grab bars in toilet stalls, sinks and paper towel dispensers that are easy to access; full length bathroom mirror; and extra space important for maneuverability. Again, when accessible features are blocked or broken, the polling place is no longer accessible.

**Best Practices**

From academic research, certain best practices have emerged with selecting locations regardless of the method used for voting. Sites should be larger and more visible, and there should be more parking spaces, voting machines & poll workers to reduce voting time. More poll workers allow for specialization of certain tasks like checking in voters, assisting them with ballots, etc. to improve the ‘service’ experience. Availability of experienced and knowledgeable poll workers to assist people with new or unfamiliar technologies enhances the voter’s experience and reduces voter errors. “When, where and how we vote: does it matter?” Robert Stein, Greg Vonnahme; Social Science Quarterly – September 2012

Many counties have shared their best practices for other jurisdictions to emulate or consider when selecting polling locations or vote centers. Larimer County, Colorado (Fort Collins) pioneered the vote center concept and the sites were first used in 2003. Their administrators noted the following regarding site selection:

- Voting locations in each geographic region must meet its voting population needs.
- Square footage must accommodate voting equipment and anticipated voter turnout.
- Adequate parking is a must, preferably on-site with good lighting and some parking spaces that are close to the building so they can be reserved for voters with disabilities.
- Locations on bus routes and major thoroughfares are preferable.
- Voting sites must be located in easily identifiable buildings.
- Sites must be available for our use for multiple days.
• When possible, use the same locations year after year.
• While many schools would make great voting locations, most schools prefer not to be used because of their concern that opening the doors of schools to the general public may create a security concern for the children there
• Preference is given to donated space, but other low-cost options are sought if a donated space is not available or cannot meet the necessary location criteria.

Austin, Texas recently moved to a vote center concept in the 2012 presidential election, turning their original precinct polling locations into vote centers and adding a few other sites for a total of 207 vote centers (with a total 247 precincts). Administrators determined this would limit voter confusion as voters adapt to the new ‘vote anywhere’ model. They intend to review data over time to consolidate or move vote centers based on turn out experience.

In 2011, Lubbock County, Texas switched to Vote Centers and went from 69 polling places to 33 vote centers. However, administrators decided to increase the number of vote centers to 50 in the 2012 presidential election to meet anticipated demand and prevent long lines.

Similar to the experience of Austin and Lubbock County, the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute study on the experience of rural Indiana pilot Vote Center counties noted there were about 3,000 active voters per vote center instead of the minimum requirement of 10,000 voters per site. If Marion County applied this rule of thumb, it would open about 214 vote centers assuming roughly 640,000 registered active voters in Marion County in November 2012.

**Administrative Perspective**

One benefit of precinct-based voting model is the largely uniform number of voters per precinct (about 1,200). Election Day voters have only one option for a voting location. As such, turnout can be reasonably predicted at each polling location using historic data. While more sites are needed, it is likely easier to find accessible locations, because you need to meet smaller demand of voters (500-600 voters, instead of 3,000-5,000 voters). Also, poll workers and the facility are likely nearby and familiar with voters, such that voters are more likely to be familiar with the location, its parking, entrances/exits, and have likely been inside and know their way around. Given forced proximity of locations, precinct-based locations may be more accessible for voters lacking transportation or using mobility devices like scooters or electronic wheelchairs.

Historic precinct data is not reliable in predicting where voters will vote on Election Day. Because voters have more choices of where to vote, it is largely impossible to predict where voters might choose to vote that thus predict the need for staff and resources for each vote center. Marion County is a consolidated city and thus largely urban and high population density in many parts of the county. By contrast, most vote center counties have several smaller city centers that people are used to visiting and have available infrastructure in place, thus making it easier to spread out and predict Vote Center turnout. To meet minimum state requirements, each site needs to accommodate up to 10,000 voters and provide accessible voting to an unknown number of voters with disabilities. Voters may also be less familiar with poll workers or facility.

From a customer/voter experience perspective, election officials must consider the relationships among the number of voters, the amount of space, amount of voting machines, and the limited amount of time available to voting. Turn out predictions can provide an approximate number of voters that must be able to pass through a location for
voting. Time is limited to 12 hours – from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. – in Indiana for voters to vote on Election Day. Polling locations must accordingly be able to accommodate the amount of open space, number of staff, and number of voting machines needed to permit a given number of voters over that 12-hour period. Inadequate quantities of any of these resources can turn an otherwise adequate site into a failed location. The higher the number of voters that are anticipated, the larger amount of resources is necessary.

\[
\text{# voters} = \text{fn[time\{space + personnel + technology\}]}
\]

The size of polling location puts a constraint on the number of voters it can reasonably process in 12-hours. Precinct-based voting is easier to predict – about 1,200 voters assigned to 1 precinct and established history helps identify low and high turnout locations. Vote Centers need to accommodate up to 10,000 voters but it is difficult to determine what sites will be busy. Turnout will not be equally distributed across the county.

Early voting in the Clerk’s Office most closely replicates a Vote Center experience. Similar to Vote Centers, voters from across the county may visit the office to vote before Election Day. During the 2012 Presidential Election, Marion County had 640,675 total registered voters. 361,416 total ballots were cast. Of that, 59,202 ballots were absentee/early votes. That meant that 302,214 ballots were cast at precincts on Election Day at the County’s 597 voting precincts - an average of 506 voters per precinct.

The Sunday immediately preceding Election Day is traditionally the busiest day for in-person early voting in the Clerk’s Office. During that Sunday in 2012, the Election Board and Clerk’s staff processed 4,227 voters in 12 hours (8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.). As an example of a site capable of accommodating a large number of voters in 12 hours, consider the following characteristics of the Clerk’s office and the resources that were brought to bear:

- Paid street parking; two side lots reimbursing parking fees for early voters
- Building largely accessible to voters with disabilities, two entrances/exits with ramps and automatic doors
- 6-10 Marion County Sheriff Deputies assisting with crowd control
- Election Board Staffing
  - 10 staff processing voters into statewide voter registration system
  - 5 staff pulling pre-printed ballots
  - 6 teams (12 people) of bi-partisan judges initialing ballots/greeting voters
  - 6 teams (12 people) of bi-partisan judges receiving ballots
  - 12 people from Clerk’s Office management team and other Election Board personnel to fill-in gaps
- Technology
  - 25 laptops with Dymo label printers
  - Assistance from ISA to set-up and trouble shoot
  - Used pre-printed ballots as previous experience noted a bottle-neck at the ballot on demand printers (usually 2-3 per site)
  - 2 iVotronics
  - 50 voting booths including ADA-compliant booths
  - 6 gray ballot box to store paper ballots sealed in security envelopes
  - 3 in use; 3 as back-up

On Sunday, November 4, 2012, it took most voters about 1.5 hours to go through the entire process – waiting in line, processing and voting. Based on historical precedent, most voters would consider 1.5 hours to vote on Election Day inordinately long and unacceptable.
Module 4: Voting Technology, Part I (Current Voting System)

Following the 2000 presidential election, Congress determined it was time to update and modernize the election methods in the United States. In 2002, they passed the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) and set aside funds to help states update voting systems and create minimum standards. These changes included, but were not limited to, uniform provisional voting, statewide voter registration databases, administrative complaint procedures, and updated and upgraded voting equipment.

There are five main requirements HAVA places on voting systems. First, all voters are permitted to verify the votes selected on the ballot before it is cast and counted. Second, states must provide the voter with the opportunity to change the ballot or correct any error before the ballot is cast and counted. This includes the opportunity to correct the error, even if this means issuing a new ballot. Third, all voting systems must notify a voter if they have overvoted or voted for more than the maximum number of selections permitted in a contest, and the system or procedure must allow the voter a chance to correct these errors. Fourth, jurisdictions must provide ballots in alternative languages, as required by Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Lastly, all voting systems must be auditable, meaning the system must produce a permanent paper record or ballot image. This audit record must be available for any contest or recount. These requirements were incorporated into Marion County’s voting machine purchase.

At the end of 2002, Marion County entered into a Voting Machine Purchase, Support Services, and Software License Agreement with Election Systems & Software, Inc. (ES&S) in order to switch from the outdated mechanical lever machines to an electronic voting system. This system included two voting machines to comply with HAVA requirements: the Model 100 and the iVotronic. The Model 100, or M100, is a basic optical scan paper ballot reader. While they may be referred to as paper ballots, Indiana Election Code differentiates between “paper ballots” and “ballot cards.” According to Indiana law, the optical scan reader uses “ballot cards;” however, for the purposes of this report, any reference to paper ballot will actually mean “ballot card.” Ballots are primarily printed by the election services vendor, but most absentee ballots are printed using Ballot on Demand (BOD) printers. Code requires that ballot quantities be determined by a formula for all primary elections, and in general elections, one ballot is printed for each registered voter to avoid shortages. BOD printers are available on Election Day to print ballots in emergency situations.

To vote using the M100, the voter simply uses a black ball point ink pen to darken the oval to the left of his or her choice. If the voter makes a mistake or makes any other stray or identifying marks on the ballot, a new one will be issued. Once finished with the ballot, the voter feeds the ballot into the machine, and the scanner reads and tabulates the votes. If for some reason the voter overvotes, the machine will beep and indicate to the poll worker and voter which race or races contain(s) overvotes. The results are stored on a PCMCIA flash card, referred to as the M100 card, secured in the machine.

The M100 alone does not satisfy the accessibility requirements of HAVA because it does not provide a confidential and independent voting experience to voters with visual disabilities. The iVotronic features an audio-enabled ballot, Braille buttons, and a screen with large text for low vision voters. The large on-screen buttons require less precise hand movements than a typical optical scan ballot. Additionally, the terminal can be removed from the case and be placed on most flat surfaces. While these machines were purchased specifically for their disability voting features, they are available to any voter.
In order to activate the iVotronic machine, a poll worker must insert the Personalized Electronic Ballot (PEB) cartridge and then choose the correct precinct and ballot style for that voter. The PEB also serves as a security device because the machine will not permit voting without the activation step. Once activated, the voter uses the touch screen or the buttons on the machine to make selections. As required by HAVA, the iVotronic reviews all selections with the voter before the ballot is cast, including warning the voter if any races have been omitted or if the voter did not reach the maximum number of votes allowed (undervote). All votes are stored on the machine until the unit is closed at the end of the day. When the machine is closed, results data is transferred to the PEB and a removable, back-up compact flash card. Poll workers return the PEB, the M100 card, and the iVotronic compact flash card to one of four regional sites, along with all of their other materials.

It is important to point out that Marion County has an extremely unique voting machine set up. Of the two machines, the M100 is the one with a printer. There is an external printer pack available that can print results directly from the iVotronic terminal, but these were not purchased in 2002. To satisfy HAVA and Indiana Election Code, ES&S had to create and certify special software to allow the iVotronic data to be transferred to the M100 through a device called a PEB reader so that the M100 can collate the results and print a totals tape. Not only is it already confusing to poll workers to have to open, operate, and close two different machines, this work-around creates a third temperamental device that was never intended to be used in this manner. Marion County is the only jurisdiction in the United States, and possibly the world, to use this complicated system configuration.

**Features and Challenges of Current Voting Equipment**

Some of the features identified by staff about the M100 or other optical scan readers follow.

- **Speed.** Once a paper ballot has been completed and reviewed by a voter, it only takes seconds to feed it through the machine.
- **Verifiable, auditable paper trail.**
- **Flexibility in setting up the polling location.** The scanner only requires one electrical outlet, and the accompanying paper ballot voting booths require no electricity.
- **Familiarity to voters.** The paper ballot is overwhelmingly the preferred choice by Marion County voter with only around 1,000 voters (out of 650,000 voters) using the iVotronic in any given election.
- **Emergency ballot bin.** If the scanner is malfunctioning or there is another emergency rendering the scanner inoperable, the unit sits on top of an emergency ballot bin that can used to securely store voted ballots until the situation is remedied.

Staff also identified challenges using optical scan readers exclusively:

- **Stray or incorrect marks on ballots.** As mentioned above, if a voter makes a stray mark or fills in too many ovals incorrectly, the ballot will not read through the machine. This is fine if the voter is still present, but if the voter is not present, the Precinct Board must determine a remedy. This usually means remaking the ballot with a bipartisan team.
- **The optical scan bars are very sensitive.** During transport, the machines endure a great deal of jostling, and this can cause an otherwise perfectly performing machine to malfunction on Election Day.
- **Folded ballots are sometimes difficult for the optical scanner to read.** This requires the Precinct Election Board to remake the ballot, slowing down Election Day operations.
- **Only one precinct’s results can be safely stored and tabulated by the current optical scan system, making it inflexible to use in a multi-precinct layout (i.e. vote centers or “super precincts”).**
The Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) system in Marion County is the iVotronic. Features include:

- No ballot printing costs. Because the entire voting process is electronic, there is no need to print a traditional ballot. Even provisional ballots can be cast on the iVotronic. However, many jurisdictions print additional paper ballots as a “fail-safe” measure in the event of long lines or machine malfunctions.
- The iVotronic provides a HAVA compliant accessible voting experience. Using the larger screen and easy to touch buttons or the audio ballot function, where the machine reads the ballot and the voter’s choices, these are not options with a paper ballot.
- Redundancy of storage. During the voting day, votes and audit data are stored in three separate memory chips on the machine. This includes a screen grab of every ballot page for every voter. Then, once the machine is closed at the end of the day, the data is transferred to the PEB and the removable flash card. A copy of the voting and audit data also remains on the machine until it is cleared, if the PEB or flash card is damaged or unavailable.
- Accuracy. The iVotronic is accurate in three main ways. First, there is no opportunity for the voter or poll worker to make stray marks on an electronic ballot. Second, the voter cannot overvote on this machine because the software prohibits it. The machine will allow an undervote, but this could be the will of the voter. Lastly, before the voter casts his or her ballot, the software asks the voter to confirm all of his or her choices.
- Clear instructions. Both the visual ballot and audio ballot provides the voter with clear instructions throughout the entire voting process.
- Flexible. The iVotronic terminal is flexible in two major ways. First, it can be programmed to hold a large number of ballot styles—certainly all of Marion County’s ballot styles for even the biggest election. Second, the terminal itself can be removed from its case and be placed on a table or wheelchair tray so voters who may not be able to stand at the unit while voting can still take advantage of this option.

Challenges with Marion County’s current iVotronic system include:

- Speed. A voter will likely need to take more time using the visual or audio ballot functions. For the visual ballot, there are at least two tutorial screens, and then the ballot itself may be two to five screens. Before the voter finishes, he or she must review the choices, and then confirm them. The audio ballot takes longer to complete, for most voters
- Limited access. Only one voter at a time can access the iVotronic—which is warranted. However, unless there is a sufficient number of machines to accommodate the volume of voters, lines become longer due to the length of time it takes to cast a ballot.
- Awkward and difficult set-up. Poll workers struggle with physically setting up the machine. It requires at least two people, and the unit is heavy. Also, once set up, the poll worker must open the machines and combine the results using the PEB reader properly, or there will be technical issues with both the M100 and the iVotronic.
- Font Size. Sometimes there is a race or contest that requires a number of characters. In order to get the entire name of the race or the name of the candidate on one line, the size of the font must be reduced. The size cannot go below codified minimums, but this makes it even harder for low vision voters to see.
- No paper trail. This generation of iVotronic does not include a Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail (VVPAT). Therefore, the unit does not display or store a separate paper record of each vote, in the event of a challenge or contest.
**Machine Security**

The Indiana Election Code outlines basic voting system requirements. Each machine must use redundant storage, including but not limited to, retention of ballot and/or an electronic image of each voter’s cast ballot. Machines must have built-in diagnostic software that can detect and report the system’s status. In other words, the machine must inform the poll worker and/or voter of any problem that arises during the voting day. This could be anything as simple as the machine accidentally becomes unplugged and is running on battery power to something more serious like an optical scan bar is malfunctioning.

Software must be written in a modular and static fashion and cannot be self-modifying. This means that the software cannot be written to diagnose its own problems and correct them. If this happened, essentially the software would produce a new version of itself. Of course software with this design has multiple implications, but there are two notable reasons: any new version of software must be certified with the state and software that can change itself without the direction of a human could, in theory, change votes.

Each machine must include an audit record. For most machines, this means that it records every single event, user initiated or not, that happens from the second it is turned on to the second it is turned off for the day. All machines must be able to produce a zero tape at the beginning of the day. This printed record shows that there are no votes on a machine, and the machine is ready to accept voters. In Marion County, we use the PEB reader to take the electronic “zero tape” from the PEB and print it on the M100 zero tape. All machines must be able to be tested for accuracy. This includes the state required public test where a set of ballots are cast on each machine in a predictable pattern, and those votes are tabulated to ensure that what was cast on the machine is what was recorded by the machine. Finally, all access to the machines and other security features must be disclosed by the vendor when applying for state certification. All system access procedures are determined at the county level, once a voting system has been purchased.

**Health of the Current System**

**M100 Optical Scanner System:** The county currently owns 737 ES&S M100 Optical Scanners and approximately 787 steel ballot bins. Ten to fifteen of these bins have been stripped of parts to repair other bins. ES&S no longer manufactures the M100, so parts acquired by the County’s election services vendor to repair the machines are primarily refurbished. The M100 PCMCIA card is no longer in mass production because they are an obsolete technology. The card includes a separate battery that must be replaced every four to five years, per the manufacturer. Likewise, the card contains a separate onboard battery that gives the entire card a shelf life because when this onboard battery dies, the card is useless. All of these factors make the M100 cards more expensive to replace. During transportation, the M100 and the steel ballot bins cause excess wear and tear. As mentioned before, a machine that has been tested and is operating perfectly at the machine storage facility may experience problems on Election Day because the jostling of the scanner affects the scan bars. The older the machines get the more widespread this problem is becoming.

**iVotronic Touch Screen Terminal System:** The county currently owns 613 ES&S iVotronic Touch Screen Terminals, 615 cases and 504 working PEB readers. The pins on the connection ends of PEB reader cables are easily damaged making it difficult to maintain a connection with the M100. PEB readers were never really designed to be portable, so they break easily. The iVotronic PEB also requires maintenance from time to time. The onboard battery needs to be replaced every four to five years depending on use.
**Tabulation Network and Hardware:** The tabulation network, which consists of a server, modem bank, and desktop workstations, was purchased in 2002 and set-up in 2003. It is a closed system, or a system that does not have access to an outside network or the internet. Because of state certification requirements, the hardware cannot be updated and must run on obsolete operating system unless the state approves an upgrade to the hardware and/or the software. As a result, the hardware is very outdated, and finding replacement parts for failing hardware is difficult. There are six laptops, four of which are used for regional site results collection on election night. A modem has failed in one of the units, but is otherwise operational. Lastly, AT&T has indicated at the end of 2012 that it may start to phase out support for some types of landlines, like the ones we use to transmit results data on election night. If this becomes a reality, a new option will have to be explored.

**Tabulation Software:** The proprietary software UNITY, written and sold by ES&S, is used to build the ballot, prepare M100 cards and iVotronic PEBs and cards. It also is the primary results tabulation system. UNITY was written and certified for Windows XP Service Pack 1 only. This is another reason why the network is closed. The computers on the network have never been connected to the internet, and therefore, have never had updates or software patches applied. Even if we just wanted to update the tabulation computers, it is unclear at this time if these computers would tolerate running Windows XP Service Pack 1 because of significant upgrades in hardware and other software.

**Service Contracts and License Agreements:** All of the service contracts and end-user licenses associated with the machines and software will expire at the end of 2014. This includes all the software that runs the tabulation network as well as the software and firmware that runs each voting machine. Minimally, the County and Election Board will have to enter into a new election services contract, and if a new voting system is not purchased, it will have to negotiate an extension of the UNITY software license agreement with ES&S. The state may decertify our version of UNITY, and it’s possible that ES&S could stop supporting the software as well.

The current Marion County voting system and technology still has useful life and ongoing maintenance ensures secure and safe elections. However, all of the technology is outdated, which means any repairs or part replacements are difficult to find and cost more. Each election we are seeing more machines with problems on Election Day. The hardware in our tabulation network is severely outdated, and the software licenses can be renewed, but they may not be supported and prevent updating outdated hardware.

**Practical Considerations and Current Limitations**
There are a number of practical considerations for using our current voting system in either a precinct-based or vote center model. Newer technologies exist to alleviate many of these issues, but this section will explore and illustrate the limitations of the current system.

**M100 Optical Scan:** The M100 is a self-contained voting machine, which means it does not rely on any other machines or accessories to operate during the voting day. For best results, it is programmed to accept ballot styles for only one precinct, and then one M100 unit is deployed to each of the 600 precincts. It would not be possible to program an M100 unit to read any and all ballot styles and precincts for Marion County. As discussed in the “Features” section, the M100 is fast. Delays at voting locations usually are not caused by the scanner, but when voters are waiting to be processed at the check-in table or for an open voting booth. The M100 unit also requires the use of separate voting booths for voters to complete their ballot. The Election Board typically sends four voting booths (two clamshells of two) for every precinct, but more are kept in reserve to distribute as necessary on Election Day. The optical scanner can vote about 50 people in five minutes. Unfortunately, the current M100 could never be
used as a standalone piece of equipment because it is not fully HAVA-compliant. The iVotronic would still need to be used at each location.

The final important practical consideration is the footprint or space required to use the M100s only in a precinct-based or Vote Center model. For a precinct-based system, we would operate as we do currently by preparing one unit for each of the 600 precincts. The machine’s small footprint makes it ideal for smaller polling locations—as long as there is an electrical outlet in close proximity. Poll workers would only need to open one machine, and the process really only consists of turning a key, contrary to the current system. Using one machine per precinct limits any global issues on Election Day. For example, if a coding error is discovered, but it only affects one ballot style in one precinct, this issue can be quickly contained, and the other 599 precincts are left unaffected. A machine that can handle all precincts anywhere would create a problem for global issue containment.

Using the M100 in a vote center model is extremely impractical. First, the programming and security restrictions would still require one machine per precinct. This means one vote center would require 600 machines, which is almost our entire fleet. Vote center statutes mandate one location per 10,000 active voters, so Marion County would need at least 64 vote centers and 38,500 machines—plus any maintenance reserve. Second, it would require approximately 12,600 square feet to hold just 600 units, not including any space for voter processing and voting. This is about the size of two tennis courts. Lastly, opening, maintaining, and closing 600 machines at each location would be extremely burdensome for poll workers and a poor use of resources. With so many voting machines, there would need to be a substantial increase in labor just to ensure the voter was putting their ballot in the correct machine.

**iVotronic**: Like the M100, the iVotronic has a relatively small footprint, but it is not self-contained like the M100. It requires the use of an external printer pack to print a zero or totals report, and it has no Voter Verifiable Paper Audit Trail (VVPAT). The lack of this printing capability is why we are required to use the special firmware and PEB reader to transfer this data to the M100’s printer. The terminal is designed to hold all 600 precinct ballot styles with a relatively easy procedure and navigation to bring up each ballot. Because all ballots are cast on the iVotronic itself, there would be little to no need for voting booths. The iVotronic satisfies HAVA requirements for accessibility. The most important practical issue when considering the iVotronic or similar Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting technology is that opening, closing, and voting time tends to be slower on each of these machines compared to an optical scan system. It takes approximately five to six minutes to open or close the machine. It takes approximately the same amount of time to complete a presidential election ballot, and the length of time is significantly longer if the voter must use the audio ballot. Each terminal would need to handle about 120 voters during the 12 hour voting day.

For a precinct-based model using exclusively a DRE system scale becomes an issue, just as it does for the M100. In order to process an average of 1,200 voters per precinct at a rate of 120 per hour, each precinct would need 10 machines to accommodate the volume. This means the County would need a minimum of 6,000 DRE machines, plus a maintenance reserve.

The numbers for a DRE exclusive vote center model are equally as daunting. To process the potential 10,000 active voters per site at a rate of 120 voters per machine, it would require 84 machines per site. 84 machines multiplied by the minimum requirement of 64 vote centers equals a fleet of 5,376 DRE machines, plus a maintenance reserve. A site would need at least 2,600 square feet to accommodate 84 machines, but this does not include room for
processing voters. In order to open, maintain, and close each of the machines, it would take an enormous amount of people.

In the end, the current system, while cumbersome and outdated, meets our needs for a precinct-based model. However, if any updates or changes are proposed, the voting system must be updated as well. The current system just is not flexible enough.
Module 5: Voting Technology, Part II (Other Technology Options)

The application of technology to the act of voting has quickened markedly in the last decade and the pace of change is increasing. It is necessary when considering new voting systems to understand the legal requirements in federal and state laws and that technological innovation will continue to push the boundaries of these legal requirements.

In general, the requirements of new voting systems follow.

1) Accessible to all voters and demonstrate compliance with all aspects of the federal Help America Vote Act (HAVA).
2) The voting systems must be secure and reliable, thereby ensuring confidence in the voting system and the valid tabulation of all votes.
3) The voting systems must be simple for both poll workers and voters to use, i.e., the process must be easily understood as well as easy to set-up and break-down.
4) The voting system must have the flexibility to adapt to future anticipated needs.
5) The voting system must be able to process voters quickly and efficiently.
6) The voting system must be affordable within the budgetary constraints of the county.

State Level Election Administration

Like most states, Indiana decentralizes voting equipment acquisition and maintenance contracts. Election administration is controlled by state statute and the Indiana Secretary of State is the Chief Election Official, with responsibilities related to voter registration, federal funds under the national Help America Vote Act (HAVA), and voter information and outreach. The Secretary also chairs the Indiana Recount Commission and certifies electronic poll books.

The Indiana Election Commission (IEC) is a four member bi-partisan board that addresses candidate challenges, certain election law violations, conducts campaign finance hearings and approves procedures and forms. The Indiana Election Division (IED) has two co-directors, one Democrat and one Republican, with an equal number of staff. They disseminate information to local election officials, particularly on items such as precincts and voter registration. The IED provides day-to-day support for local election administrators, as well as the general public. The staff also researches campaign finance fines and election law violations, with the IEC making the final determination.

Local Election Boards exist in all counties. They are constituted with bipartisan representation and have similar functions as the IEC, but on the local level. State laws and/or the IEC approve procedures and forms for local bodies to use.

Voting System Technical Oversight Program (VSTOP)

In 2009, pursuant to IC 3-11-16, the State of Indiana entered into a contract with Ball State University, under the auspices of the Bowen Center for Public Affairs, to administer the testing of voting systems as a part of the certification program for voting systems that are marketed and sold in the state. Along with establishing the testing program, other responsibilities included the creation of a statewide inventory of voting systems in the 92 counties, with the inventory located in an electronic database. Also, VSTOP is to track changes to voting systems that are deployed in the counties as well as the technical advisories that are issued by vendors. The first phase of VSTOP concluded in in 2013, but funding was continued for the next biennium (2013-2015).

The VSTOP team developed a protocol to test voting systems that conformed to the provisions of the Indiana election code. This protocol was reviewed by voting system vendors and received final approval of the Indiana
Election Division. The testing process begins with the vendor completing an application form (IEC 11) which is filed in the Indiana Election Division. Upon receipt of the application fee ($1,500), the VSTOP team undertakes a review of all materials and reports relevant to the manufacture and initial testing of the voting system. This document review includes examining the technical data package (TDP), reports from the Voting System Testing Lab (VSTL), and any materials pertaining to testing under the jurisdiction of the federal Election Assistance Commission (EAC).

After the document review, a functional on-site testing is scheduled. The vendor transports the voting system to Ball State University where it is set-up and tested according to the specific script of the protocol. The protocol focuses on the specific requirements of the Indiana code. A mock election is conducted with test decks created by the VSTOP team and accessibility and disability testing is conducted to assure conformance with HAVA and the requirements the Americans with Disability Act (ADA). All testing is videotaped and archived.

Following a thorough review of all testing materials, a conclusion is reached by the VSTOP team and additional testing may be required or a recommendation is drafted to be presented to the IEC. Upon the next meeting of the IEC, a recommendation is made for action by the IEC.

Testing changes to certified voting systems are referred to as Engineering Change Orders (ECOs). These changes may be minimal (de minimis)—meaning they do not involve the core functioning of the voting system, or they may be a modification, which will require closer scrutiny and may involve additional testing. There is no charge to the vendors for testing ECOs. Similar to recommendations to the IEC on voting system certification, recommendations on ECOs are developed by the VSTOP and presented to the IEC for their decision.

**Electronic Voting Systems**

An electronic voting system is “the total combination of mechanical, electromechanical, and electronic equipment (including the software, firmware, and documentation required to program, control, and support the equipment) that is used to define ballots, cast and count votes, report or display election results, connect the voting system to the voter registration system, and maintain and produce any audit trail information.” In addition, a voting system includes the practices and associated documentation used to

- Identify system components and versions of such components;
- Test the system during its development and maintenance;
- Maintain records of system errors and defects;
- Determine specific system changes made after initial certification;
- Make available any materials to the voters (such as notices, instructions, forms, or paper ballots).

All types of voting systems must have the capabilities to allow the voter the privacy to vote as he/she intends; the opportunity to revise the vote the votes before casting the ballot; to identify overvotes and undervotes; and the system must be accessible for individuals with disabilities.

**Types of Voting Systems**

There are several different configurations of voting systems. One that is easily recognizable is the Paper-Based Voting System. This type allows voters to cast votes on paper cards or sheets of paper. The votes cast are then counted and tabulated. Another type of voting system which is in wide use in the United States is the Direct-Recording Electronic Voting System (DRE). This system records votes by means of a ballot that is displayed on a
screen. The voter touches the icons on the screen which activates electromagnetic components and records the voting choices as well as the ballot images. These are then stored in memory for final counting and tabulation.

There are other types of voting equipment, including the Public Network Direct-Recording System, which use electronic ballots and transmit vote data from the polling place to another location over a public network. The vote data may be transmitted by individual ballots, or in batches, or in one batch at the end of the voting day. Another type is the Precinct County Voting System that tabulates ballots at the polling place, typically as they are cast. The vote results are then printed at the end of the Election Day. Finally, the Central County Voting System tabulates ballots from multiple voting places, such as precincts, at a central location.

**Voting Systems Technologies**

There are three main technologies used in voting systems:

- **Direct Record Electronic (DRE):** The DRE utilizes a touch screen and the voter casts a vote by touching the icon on the screen. The equipment includes a smart card reader, along with a flash memory card that stores the data, and a paper tape and printer that can print the total results from the machine.

- **Optical Ballot Scanner (OpScan):** The OpScan is a scanner that reads the voting marks on a paper ballot by inserting the paper ballot into the equipment. The pixels on the paper ballot are identified by the photo-sensor on the scanner and the choices made by the voter are recorded in a flash memory drive. After the paper ballot is “read” by the scanner, the ballot drops into a locked cabinet under the scanner.

- **Combinations (or “hybrid):** A Combination or hybrid system uses both a DRE screen which, in turn, produces a paper ballot which is then “fed” into an optical scanner that reads the voter choices.

In addition, the accessible equipment that is available for persons with disabilities has different levels of accessibility depending on the particular disability of a voter.

Throughout the United States, the OpScan system, along with the combination system is the most widely used voting system. Marion County (Indianapolis), Indiana, currently uses the combination system (hybrid). The second system in terms of use across the country is the DRE, or touch screen. Paper ballot systems are used in few states in rural voting jurisdictions that have very few active voters.

**Voting System Capabilities**

There are several specific capabilities that any voting system must have, including security, integrity, auditability, counting and tabulation, telecommunications, and data retention. Each of these have several components that are used in testing the validity and reliability of the voting system. For example, the integrity of the system means that it must have safeguards against system failure, it must protect against the interruption of electrical power, protect against environmental hazards, protect against the failure of any data input or storage device, protect against any attempt at improper data entry or retrieval, and record and report the data and time of normal and abnormal events. Each of these becomes part of the testing protocol that each voting system is required to undergo and pass before being certified for sale in Indiana.

**Voting Systems Certified in Indiana**

The following systems are certified by the Indiana Election Commission for use in the state.

- ES&S AutoMARK, AccuVOTE, Assure, Unity 3.0.1.0, Unity 3.2.1.0
- Hart InterCivic Electronic Voting System 6.2.1
• MicroVote Infinity Model VP-1, EMS 4.0B (Modification)
• Unisyn Open Elect 1.0, 1.

If another voting system is certified by the IEC, it will be posted on their website: www.in.gov/SOS/elections.

Electronic Poll Books
Electronic Poll Books (ePollbooks) replace the physical, printed poll books long used in precinct voting sites. The electronic version maintains the complete county voter roll; allows for instantaneous voter identification and verification of voting status; and facilitates county and statewide voter registration (SVRS) updates. Finally, it is the presence of electronic poll books that makes vote centers possible.

Electronic poll books are used in 24 states, but Indiana will be the first in the nation to certify ePollbooks. The 2013 state legislature requires this certification. VSTOP will test the ePollbooks to assess conformity with the Indiana code and recommend to the Secretary of State whether an ePollbook should be certified.

The electronic pollbook verifies voter eligibility, confirms that the voter has cast a ballot, and provides a transmission of that information security to every other polling place in the jurisdiction. The ePollbook must be electronically secure and have a secure updating to the SVRS.

Requirements for ePollbooks specify that the pollbook must be programmed so that the actions of two (2) election officials of opposite political parties are necessary to access the poll list. The ePollbook is not connected to a voting system and is not permitted to access voter information other than the information provided on the certified list of voters prepared under Indiana law (IC 3-7-29-1). Information must be encrypted and placed on a dedicated private server to secure connectivity between a precinct polling place or satellite absentee office and the county Election Board.

The Future of Voting Systems
As indicated in the introduction, the pace of change is quickening in the area of voting systems and election administration. Voting systems purchased after the passage of HAVA in 2002 are coming to end of life and jurisdictions throughout the country are looking to the next generation. Some states have virtually abandoned electronic voting systems and now “vote by mail.” Oregon and Washington now use this method and Colorado is moving toward the same. The County of Los Angeles is engaged in a “Voting Systems Assessment Project (VSAP)” which is considering building an electronic voting system that will be owned by the county. Other forms of electronic voting are being tested, such as facial, touch and voice recognition.

Another aspect is the time it takes to certify a system for use in a state. The idea of a “certificate of conformance” that would be completed by vendors has the potential at the federal and state levels to bring new technologies to the marketplace faster and with less expense.

Finally, there has long been concerns about electronic voting systems and whether they do, indeed, properly record and tabulate votes. In short, how easy is it to “hack” into an electronic voting system? The testing and certification process provides a very high level of confidence in the integrity of voting systems in the United States. Nothing built is perfect, including voting systems, and most citizens understand that. That is why as voting systems age, new systems and approaches must be brought on-line after being subject to rigorous testing and scrutiny. This is one critical process that underpins the voters’ confidence in our democratic elections in Indiana and across America.
Module 6: Election Administrator Roundtable & Cost Discussion

The first hour of this presentation included an election administrator roundtable with invited guests: Tippecanoe County (IN) Clerk Christa Coffey, Floyd County (IN) Clerk Linda Moeller, and Travis County (TX) Elections Director Michael Winn. All three jurisdictions currently use or are planning to implement vote centers. The guests shared their best practices – regardless of Election Day voting method. Below is the context of this discussion. (You can access the full meeting at indy.gov/CHANNEL16 through the meetings on demand.)

Election Administrator Roundtable

Beth White—Clerk, Marion County, Indiana: Why did you decide to make the change from precinct based elections to vote center based elections?

Mr. Michael Winn – Director of Elections, Travis County, Texas: We decided to make the change in Travis county to vote centers because we, about 15 years ago, initiated early voting in Travis County, and we did it using grocery stores, and we saw that the early voting concept really worked well and when we saw that we had an opportunity to do vote centers, we latched on very quickly, we embraced it, and we were very happy with the concept because it almost mirrored early voting in Texas because you could vote anywhere and we thought to ourselves why couldn’t we do that on Election Day? One of the problems that we did have for implementing this program was that we had a high number of provisional ballots, and once we implemented the vote center concept, that almost went away.

Hon. Linda Moeller – Clerk, Floyd County, Indiana: Similar reasons. We decided going into it that we would not look into a cost saving factor alone, that it would play into it but would not be our only determination, that we would be saving money or not saving money. That we were going to make sure that if we went to a vote center that it was going to be right for all of Floyd County, every single precinct and every single township. So that was our priority that the people were going to have the opportunity to vote. Less poll workers were also a concern to both political parties. And also as he said provisional ballots and early ballots, that we have a number of those every election, and we felt that a number of those were due to voter ID or improper ballot procedures could be reduced and more voters could be able to vote that way also. So his reasons were some of our reasons also.

BW: And just for edification, when was the first time that you used vote centers?

LM: We haven’t yet. We decided to use this off election year last year to study it. Let’s use this year to study it, make sure it is right for use, get all of our ducks in a row, and that is what we did in 2012 and so we used 2013 as our education process but little did we know one of our towns would want to hold a special election for a question so we will have that. Unfortunately, this only involves about 600 voters, it’s a very small town, but we feel it will be a good test run for us as well as the voters in that precinct and will be some good public relations for us as well to get the word out to the rest of the county that the change will occur next year.

BW: Thank you. Now I want to remind you all that Tippecanoe County was an early adopter, it was one of the three counties to have a pilot program a couple or three years ago, and I know you were not clerk when it was implemented, you inherited the situation from the previous clerk. But I am interested to know what you do know about the transition decision making.
Hon. Christa Coffey – Clerk, Tippecanoe County, Indiana: Well I was Chief Deputy at that time so I was very involved in the process. We applied in 2006 when the vote center pilot project was proposed and Tippecanoe and Wayne we originally selected and then Cass joined us in 2008. So our first election with vote centers was the general election of 2011 because we did not have a primary that year

**BW: Why did Tippecanoe County decide to adopt this concept?**

CC: Many of the same reasons, we did not really go into it thinking it would save money that was just kind of a nice byproduct that it has but we were having difficulty finding ADA complaint buildings in every precinct, even combining them down, it was tough to find enough buildings in the community and we have a lot of rural areas. We have Lafayette in the center of the county, and a lot of rural around it, and those areas typically don’t have the buildings that comply with ADA any longer and also poll workers. When you have to have a minimum of five at every sit, it gets tough to find enough even in a county our size.

MW: If I could interrupt, in Travis County, we implemented in the November 2011 election and the way we did it was that we did not look at it as a cost saving measure, we wanted to get our constituency used to utilizing that concept, they were already using it in early voting, so what we did was when we implemented in 2011, we did not reduce the number of poll locations, in fact what we did was we kept the same number of poll locations from previous elections and we made them all vote centers because we wanted to ease into it and see how our constituency would feel about it. Quite naturally, the parties had a little bit of push back but the constituencies really like the idea of vote centers and because they were able to catch on quickly, the parties caught on just as fast. So we have had four elections where we have implemented vote centers. We did it in the November constitutional amendment election, the spring election and now of course in Texas you cannot do it in a primary, but we did it in the Presidential election, and reviews were overwhelmingly positive.

**BW: Thank you that actually answered my next question so let me ask you this, what has changed in your plan since you first implemented?**

MW: What has changed basically in our plan is our idea of how we are going to reduce our vote centers. In Travis County we have what is called precinct chairs which are basically precinct captains of their polling location and none of them wanted to reduce or lose their site. And so by implementing this program and using it in our spring election, I think that our constituency saw that it makes sense to reduce our locations and so in the next election I think the conversation will be a little more palatable for our voting constituents to swallow and I think our governing authority will agree with us in trying to reduce some of these locations.

**BW: Thank you and Clerk Coffey I will ask you the same. How has it worked, and what has changed over time?**

CC: First of all we have been very successful in voter outreach we spent the first two or three years sending a postcard to every voter, we made that into our poll books so it kind of carried two weights. The one thing I can say is that we started with more sites than we really probably needed, but we weren’t sure how this was going to work. So the nice thing is over the four or five years that we have been doing this we have accumulated data, of where do people go to vote, where are the most popular sites, so we have been able to consolidate or eliminate some sites. One thing that we have changed is that we didn’t have electronic poll book companies in Indiana and it was a pilot so nobody was really interested in getting involved with us, until it was approved in 2011, so we actually teamed
with a group from the Purdue Research Park and created our own electronic poll book. We actually switched poll books in 2011 because now that it was approved companies were coming in so we could see the features that we really wanted to have but could not have when we had our system built.

**BW: Thank you. Now Mr. Winn, let’s talk about cost savings. Have there been cost savings and in what way?**

**MW:** Yes there have for us because we were able to train more staff and by being able to train more staff, we were able to need less staff that was working at each location. We could kind of condense down on the jobs that the poll workers were doing, and we found out that we could probably do more with less people, but it took us a couple of elections to do that. For example in the presidential election we had poll locations where we had an upwards of eight people working that locations, and this last May election cut that down to four. So I think what we are finding is that we can do more with less, condense down the training and the training is not as extensive because it is physically the same training you get during early voting. In the past we had to build curriculums, one for early voting which taught the employees and poll workers the insides and outs of being able to conduct and election with that concept that you could vote anywhere, any ballot, any time, any place. And so now our Election Day training has been reduced because we do not have to put as much time into the training and building two different manuals.

**BW: That is very helpful. Now Clerk Moeller, what kind of cost savings, if any, do you expect, or are you spending more to get ready?**

**LM:** we are doing several things this year just to get the word out about this. We are going to do a county wide mailing and things like that which we know will cost money. One of the things is every year, even when we don’t have an election, our county still budgets for an election and all of that money was stripped to help pay for the election machines that we bought, so it limits us funds-wise to do it, but we could still go out to organizations and we have a large festival in the fall called Harvest Homecoming and we will have a booth there. So we have several things lined up to try to get the word out as well. We are going to budget next year as if we were having a precinct style election on the advice of other clerks that have had vote centers, they said that the first year it is wise to budget the same and adjust the next year because you will have some cost savings but you just don’t know where yet. So obviously where we will save money is on poll workers, and on ballot printing. We were optic scan, so so had huge ballots that had to be printed and usually for each election, it was probably around 30-40 thousand dollars per election just for ballot printing and most of those went to the recycling bin right after. Obviously, we will still need paper ballots for absentee by mail and for provisional ballots but it will not compare to what we will with early voting. We have already amended our vote center plan, to include mobile vote centers, one of the concepts from the clerk’s conferences that we learned from. And these mobile centers prior to the election. We will have them at the nursing home centers, and we have about ten of them in our county, so they will be at each one of the nursing care facilities. We are also going to target the precincts that vote in the neighborhood environment. We have several neighborhood-style voting where that was one of the major concerns in the beginning. These people usually walk to their precinct. How are they going to walk to a vote center that is five miles away? So we are going to utilize the mobile vote center and be like the mobile library that we use. If you live in this neighborhood it is going to be in your neighborhood on this day so come and vote.

**BW: Are you implementing a new electronic system next year?**
LM: Yes. We liked the system that we purchased because Floyd County is one that typically wants a paper trail. We have had half a dozen recounts in the last couple of years and everyone felt that that was a major factor and they felt more secure with it. And this system allows us to have that. The system we have is a touchscreen that allows the voter to go back and forth in between choices and prints out what is similar to a credit card receipt. What we also liked about this system is that it actually prints the names of the candidates that they have voted for, which allows the voter one more chance to look at what they have done and change their mind and make corrections if they want to. Then the voter takes that ticket to a scanner and that is where the votes are tabulated. For our county that was one of the political parties’ main concerns was the security of the vote data and that it would not get out before six pm on election night. They didn’t want the data released early to influence the election. Everything is stored in that scanning system and has a history of who touched it and where and when. They felt it was a one size fits all security operation. They felt it satisfied the people that needed to have a paper trail besides the electronic machine.

BW: Thank you. Clerk Coffey can you talk about cost. Is this saving money or not?

CC: Yes, it is saving money. I would say that the first year don’t estimate that you will have any cost savings because you have to purchase equipment, an electronic poll book, and things that go with that such as scanners, printers and signature pads. That equipment costs money so I don’t anticipate the first year having any savings. In fact we have to purchase new equipment based on the 2013 election legislation passed and working on our vote center plan to comply with that. One of the things we did in the first couple of years since we were a pilot and we did not know if it would stay, we used recycled desktops for our computer systems rather than invest the money. Once we knew vote centers was a concept to stay, we purchased basic laptops that our IT departments said would meet what we needed to do for the voting and replace all the desktops because carry laptops was a whole lot easier. The consistent savings for us was in poll workers. We have 116 precincts now and estimate trimming it down to about 100 precinct sites and that is still 500 poll workers and we did the November election with just over 100 poll workers with vote center. Those cost savings cannot be quantified it is just tremendous. Ball State did a survey our first couple of years and they estimated we save $50,000 every election over the cost of precinct based voting.

Ed Treacy, Democratic Party: Two questions. How early do they start voting for early voting and what are the ramifications for precinct organizations? How are precinct people integrated into this or are they integrated into this?

CC: Those are both issues that we have dealt with. As far as the precinct officials, they are still involved, quite honestly they were having issues with finding enough people just because the five people that worked well together for 30 years and served the public well did not mean they wanted to continue doing it or were physically able to do so. So we took the best of our poll workers. The nice thing is with vote centers is that we have created the next generation of poll workers because the younger people and middle aged people like technology and flipping through a book looking for a name would make me insane. And in regards to early voting, we start voting in the office 28 days before the election. We start voting in the office in the first week because if there is a problem we want to catch it before we start getting votes in the system and after that we are one of the counties that travels. We take it [early voting mobile sites] to our long care sites, Purdue’s campus, grocery stores, we take it to the voter as much as we can to encourage early voting because for vote centers you have to get a significant number of voters to vote before Election Day or you will never survive an Election Day with vote centers. Vote centers in terminology are technically only on Election Day. Satellite vote centers are used during the absentee period and we start that three weeks before. We typically have 15 to 19 open depending on the election and where people are living that are
registered to vote. We also go to the small towns. Like I said Tippecanoe county in urban centrally, but rural all around, so we do go to the small towns on a Saturday morning and send postcards out to tell people when we will be there and what hours, which has been very successful.

**Ed Treacy, Democratic Party: In our county, the only early voting is at the Clerk’s Office, so in that situation, I am not sure we can get that many people early voting**

CC: Clerk White has been very successful in getting people pushed through in those hours. I watch the media coverage too. I guess I am fortunate to live in a county where we can all agree that the voter is the top priority.

**Ed Treacy, Democratic Party: So it would be difficult to integrate if you do not have early voting?**

CC: It would be next to impossible.

**BW: could you tell us what your plan calls for in regards to early voting sites and how early?**

LM: In our plan now, we have four early voting sites, and we are going to utilize the mobile sites in addition, and we may add to that as it goes along, but we feel, since we have four townships, that it is more or less moving that around. So we will start early vote of course in the Clerk’s Office 15 days before and early vote sites outside of that and start using the mobile voting as well. And also we still have travel board that is still the human touch of going to the people’s homes. That is still needed to do that as well. As for the precincts, we are addressing that right now because we are concerned about that. The precinct committee men always got the poll workers. That was one of the things in our county that was their responsibility. They did the best that they could and struggled in needing a lot of different directions to fill all of our election boards. So what we are going to do in the fall is have a poll worker day, to come and see this new system and experience it. That way these people are still going to be interested in staying on board and going forward with this. We will have a little picnic for them, we don’t want them to be afraid of it just because somebody is of elder age it doesn’t mean they don’t want to do it and they are not capable of doing it. I know when we changed court management system, our oldest lady working in our city county building was the best for us for new computer systems. We want everybody to be included. We do not want to diminish the precinct committee men so we are going to do a joint gathering in September and make them be a part of it.

**BW: Mr. Winn let’s come to you for these next questions. First of all early voting. How early, how many sites, and how has that worked for you. The second question has to do with political parties in specific and I believe you call them precinct captains, and how has that worked.**

MW: For early voting in Travis County, and you have seen our spec sheet, we have roughly 600,000 registered voters and 210 precincts so what we do for early voting we have 24 permanent early voting sites. These are sites that are in grocery stores, recreation centers or other places where people gather. And for those sites, we do it on a mobile basis, much like Floyd county. We do nursing homes, we do government day where we hit all of the government buildings here in Austin, TX, we will do long term care facilities. We try to target places where large numbers of people congregate and try to service them. Early voting typically runs from 10-12 days prior to election, but you shut it down 2 days before Election Day. What we have found since we have started using early voting and vote centers is that the paradigm has kind of shifted. We kind of have more people voting early and we don’t have the rush on Election Day. We noticed that in the last spring election and we almost rivaled that in the November presidential
election, there was a 45 to 55 split. The trend that we are seeing now is that there are more people coming out and voting early than on Election Day. In Travis County, what we do is rather than rely on the party captains to do the recruitment for Election Day, we ask them to provide us with lists of possible poll workers for a partisan election and non-partisan elections, we try to utilize those same lists and we recruit and staff all of the same locations and the reason why we do that is because we want to ensure that we have complete coverage of our polling locations so by doing it that way, in the last four or five years, we have been able to completely fulfill our obligations for all of our polling locations about a week to ten days before the election. It takes away the added stress of trying to recruit workers for each polling locations from the parties. The parties have responded very well. What we do in Travis County, we include the party chairs at every meeting prior to an election, so they might attend maybe three or four meetings. We give them a progress report of where we are in terms of recruitment and what our expectations are of them and what theirs are of us. It has worked very well and we seem to have a good relationship with the parties involved.

Chris Douglas, Republican Party: During that ten to twelve days of early voting, can you graph the flow of the voting, whether it tends to be front loaded, or peak at the end, or spread evenly across those ten to twelve days?

MW: It depends on the election. In the presidential election, the first days were kind of heavy and then it kind of dropped off, and in the last days it picked up quite a bit. In the spring election, it was very slow in the beginning, but in the last four or five days, the numbers picked up substantially. So I would say it depends on the election. If it is an election where you have municipalities and school boards, I tend to think it would be slow, and the graph would start off slow and then peak and go high. In the presidential election, it would be like a “V” it would start off high then go low then come back up again.

BW: Thank you. Clerk Caffey would you like to answer that in your experience?

CC: We have about the same trend lines. Presidential elections are heavier all the way through. There is the initial excitement when people know they can come and vote, and then it drops off during the weekdays, and then picks back up on the weekend and up until the election, up until that Monday until noon in the office it is lines until two or three in the afternoon to get those people processed.

BW: What percentage do you vote early including both in person and mail?

CC: Consistently we run about 40%. I know Wayne and Cass County do things a little bit differently and they run at about 50% voting early.

BW: If you had to characterize how your voters feel about this, are they happy with this, and if you were to go back to a precinct based system would there be unrest, or would they be happy to go back?

MW: Definitely in Travis County they would stay with the vote center concept. Overwhelmingly.

CC: I had the privilege of taking office January 1, 2011 and the pilot program was ending but we had an election in May. So the first decision I was making as Clerk with personal and attorney assistance was what do I do? We can’t go back to precinct voting, we didn’t have time. Fortunately it made it through legislature in time and I didn’t have to decide which law I was going to break. We were prepared to do what Orange County did to get the legislation
through which was to start bussing voters down staking out the statehouse and lobby for vote centers to continue. I don’t know how we could go back now. They love it. They have gotten used to it. They say, normally I vote at the fairgrounds, but today I am working at Purdue so I can go vote at Purdue. So there was strong support for the vote centers being a permanent concept.

**BW: Clerk Moeller, how are voters reacting to the change that they see?**

LM: So far they have been pretty positive. Most notably, since they had known we were going to vote centers, the people that we had to deal with provisional ballots. And the most common phone call we received was where do I vote and at 6 p.m. I am in the city, do I have to go back to somewhere else in the county to vote. We tell voters that that was the most important part in why we decided to change. Of course it was unanimous for our election board but it was also unanimous in our county commissioners and council as well. That was one of the main things we looked at because people will no longer have to worry about where they belong to vote and they can vote at any location that they want. And that was one of the most important things for us: to stop the provisional ballots of people being in the wrong place to vote. Now when they get their voter registration card it doesn’t have their polling location and we have had several people come in and ask “OK you said to go to the vote center, but where is it?” SO we show them where they will be. And we are doing an extensive thing on our website to make that more informative and to add a Google or MapQuest thing so they can find a location. But most of our precincts were already clustered. We had four and five precincts voting at one location. We have only two new locations that are vote centers and all the rest were polling places prior to that. And just to make them go out of the box we are having one automotive center that is going around to the towns. We are doing things like that. SO far the voters have been receptive. We have a large group in our town that have special needs and they have been kept in the loop of this every step of the way, and are very favorable of the ADA complaint things that we are doing. More polling sites will be more accessible with this concept.

**Brad Klopfenstein, Libertarian Party: My first question is for the counties that have already used vote centers. Which locations have worked better is it the commercial centers like a supermarket or public locations, government buildings or even the churches?**

MW: I have to things to add. What my colleague said about trying to utilize the website trying to engage the public, we are doing something similar. We have identified our vote centers and we are telling our voters, in real time, how many people are in line. If they want they can select a vote center, and we direct them to that location. To answer your question about success rates in terms of locations, the grocery stores are by far the best. They triple and quadruple the turnout of other locations.

CC: Ironically we have the same situation. Our four payless sites which are Kroger stores in Lafayette and West Lafayette are our long term sites. So people know that once we are there we are there for the long haul, for about ten days. So if they come by and our line is long, they know they can come back two days later when they need milk or butter or whatever. In early voting those have been our most successful sites. As far as Election Day, Purdue and the fairgrounds are our most successful sites.

**Brad Klopfenstein, Libertarian Party: My other question is about mobile vote centers. What has been your success at fairs, festivals and that sort of thing? I mean I am envisioning the Irvington Halloween Festival or a Colts game or any other large event.**
MW: Well, we take our mobile vote centers to office buildings. We also have a lot of State agencies, so we make the rounds there, and we tend to have quite a few people who are housed in those buildings come out and vote. The other one is nursing homes and long term care facilities.

CC: Same concept. We have two large long-term care centers and we are typically there for a full day. One thing you must consider is that to be an early satellite site you must be open to the public, so it is not just for your residents, it is for anyone in the community that wants to come out to vote.

*Ed Treacy, Democratic Party: Candidate oriented question. What happens to candidates running for township office or state legislative office try to campaign? I don’t know how this works for them.*

CC: I will tell you that that first two years, candidates hated vote centers. They still had their calendars that Election Day was Tuesday so they would plan their big mailing on Thursday before everyone went out to vote. Well now we have 40% of voters in before Election Day. So when creating a timeline for campaigning, you have to start much earlier. The nice thing about vote centers and using electronic poll books which you can do now without switching to vote centers is that you can tell when people vote. You know what areas to target earlier because those people are going to come out as soon as early voting starts. A large number of people in Tippecanoe County like to vote on Election Day. I have asked many and they say “no, I want to cast my vote on Election Day.”

*BW: the other thing about that question is what do candidates do on Election Day? As a candidate I know that if your candidates could be anywhere, it would be hard to decide where you actually spend your time.*

CC: And typically people do vote closer to where they live, so you would still target the sites that are closer to where you live. That is the trend, people do vote closer to where they live, than where they work.

*Chris Douglas, Republican Party: How is the location for the mobile vote centers determined and I guess what I am wondering is that it seems like either party could skew the locations of mobile vote centers?*

MW: The way we do it here in Travis County is that I try to balance out the location of mobile vote centers. We are governed by four commissioner precincts, so we try to balance our mobile centers out across these four commissioner precincts. That way we try to make it equal, that way when it comes to involving political parties they are given the list to look at, so they have input as to where some of those locations are. I think as long as we have equal representation on the board of commissioner precincts, I have never had an issue where they have come back and said I do not agree with your locations.

*BW: For everyone’s edification, in Travis County they elect their election commissioners which are what Mr. Winn is talking about. So it is a little bit of a different structure. We of course have out appointed three election board members and you have four is that correct Mr. Winn?*

MW: That is correct we have four commissioners and a county judge.

CC: Clerks around the state, as vote centers are coming online, are doing more creative things that make me wonder if we should think about that. Vanderburgh County, which is comparable to my county looked at both party chairs
and said and I am going to take the list give and the list you give and unless there is an ADA compliance issue, we will go to all of them. And they ended up agreeing on the sites which were public libraries and things like that. She said I am not playing politics, if you want five sites and you want five sites we will examine the locations and go there.

**Lowell Shroyer, Democratic Party: What kind of change if any did you see in otherwise absentee balloting? Were people still mailing in the same quantities?**

CC: Are ballots by mail in-county dropped dramatically because typically even if people do not want to go out to their polling location on Election Day, they will be in the grocery store or what have you. So absentee ballot by mail and traveling boards dropped dramatically for us.

MW: It pretty much stayed the same for Travis County. For presidential elections, we have an increased number of absentee ballots. For other election, the numbers are there, but it is not as much. I have not seen any big change.

**Cost Discussion**

As the Election Board looks forward it must contemplate the purchase of a new voting system. The current system is not sustainable for the long term, and it is not adaptable for future Election Board business needs. Consensus derived from the Study Group noted any future system must be secure; it must be accurate; it must be able to accommodate a central count of absentee ballots; it must be easy for poll workers to set-up and tear down; it must be easy for voters to use; and, it must be HAVA/ADA compliant.

All other new voting system considerations are largely dictated by choices. For example, should the system have a Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail (VVPAT)? If so, what kind? Should it be a paper ballot; should it be a printed record of a ballot or vote; should it be an electronic record that can be printed; or, should it be some combination of these options? It seems that whichever option is selected, it should be the one that is most adaptable to future business needs.

Another choice includes the option of an optical scan or combination optical scan/DRE system. Both of these choices would include some form of ballot printing costs. There are generally two types of printed ballots made available to voters: preprinted ballots or ballot on demand (BOD). Marion County currently uses preprinted ballots at $0.32 per ballot. Depending on the voting method used, this option can be less flexible because, for example, in a vote center environment, each location would have to stock every ballot.

The second type of ballot is a ballot on demand. Currently, Marion County uses this type of ballot for all of absentee ballot operations, including in-person early voting. Marion County also uses this option on Election Day for any last minute ballot needs. In a vote center environment, there would be a number of BOD printers so that after a voter checks-in at the table, their ballot is printed for them. This option provides the greatest flexibility, but the current system comes at a cost. Compatible printers with our software range from $3,500 to $3,700 in price.

The County has the choice of not printing ballots at all and using a direct recording electronic (DRE) only system. Paper ballots would still be needed for absentee mail voting, potentially in-person early voting, and for an emergency reserve on Election Day. The disadvantage to this choice is that with a DRE only system, without a paper ballot or some kind of printed record, there is no “hard copy” paper trail.
In contemplating new voting systems, the Election Board and the Board of Voters Registration might also consider alternative poll book options. This includes the ePollbook (electronic poll book) options currently being certified with the Indiana Election Division. There are two choices: continue to print poll books or move to an ePollbook system. It is important to point out that because of the new statutory changes, ePollbooks can be adopted by the County regardless of the Election Day voting method. Today, it costs about $45,000 each election to print poll books. This choice is only practical in a precinct-based election. In a vote center model, each check-in station would need to have a printed poll book that includes every registered voter in the county. Furthermore, it would not be possible for poll workers in 600 individual precincts to communicate to prevent a person from voting more than once.

The County could purchase ePollbooks, which would eliminate the need for printed paper poll books. This technology is required in a vote center model. The Election Board and the Board of Voters Registration would need to carefully consider whether or not to connect the ePollbooks to a central server. If connected, it would require internet connectivity in polling locations, but all data could be maintained in real time. A system not centrally connected could be networked at each location, but the real-time information would be lost. Either way, the data could be gathered after Election Day to help with updating the statewide voter registration system.

The choice to continue with precinct-based elections includes labor costs. Currently, the parties and Election Board must recruit more than 3,000 poll workers, and the total pay is about $234,000 per election. In a vote center model, the number of poll workers needed and the division of labor would be solely driven by the type of plan adopted by the Election Board. This model does not eliminate the need for party appointed poll workers, but it does require more sophisticated staff to handle the technology.

How and where we use support staff is affected by what type of voting method is chosen. In a precinct-based election, one centralized dispatch location is preferred. However, in a vote center model, staff would need to be spread out around the county. For example, the Election Board may need to station hotline staff, supplies, and mechanics at each location, or at least regionally. This option would require a significant increase in staff volume. It’s also less efficient than the centralized method we use currently. Lastly, it more difficult to ensure consistency in communications between sites when addressing legal or process issues.
Study Group Feedback

The essential challenge facing the Marion County Election Board in the coming months is the expiration of critical long-term software and vendor contracts at the end of 2014. Resolving this challenge must also involve careful consideration of the Election Board’s – still-viable, but ever-aging and obsolete – current IT infrastructure and voting machines. The Board’s two fundamental options are to (1) attempt to extend the current contracts and continue with the current, aging system for as long as the system remains viable and vendors continue to support it; or (2) procure a new, updated voting system in 2014. Notwithstanding the Election Board’s ultimate choice, the Board will eventually have to purchase a new voting system. As such, the second and certainly more nebulous question facing the Election Board is: what should future voting in Marion County be like?

The 18-members of the Marion County Voter Experience Project met for several sessions over a period of three months to better understand election administration and share their perspectives about Election Day voting. The group’s perspectives are being provided for the benefit of the Marion County Election Board, but should not be considered recommend outcomes for the County. The Election Board is the administrative and governing body that will consider, deliberate, and make the concrete choices. As such, the bi-partisan Election Board are free to consider the Study Group’s perspectives and ideas as part of its decision-making process.

Based on all the information and options presented to it through this portion of the Voter Experience Project, the Study Group offers the Election Board the following perspectives and ideas to consider as the Election Board begins to grapple with the issues described above.

Overall Themes

Five main themes emerged from the six Study Group sessions follow.

- Voting should be accessible and convenient.
- A new system must be cost effective (both short- and long-term).
- Technology should be used to improve the process without setting it back in unintended ways.
- The overall voting process should be fundamentally fair and nondiscriminatory.
- The public must have confidence in the system.

As Marion County explores the possibility of purchasing new voting equipment in the near future, these themes will help guide the bi-partisan Election Board in their decision-making. The following sections – voting technology, polling locations and poll workers – further explore these themes of improving the voter experience in greater detail.
Voting Technology

Future Voting System (Equipment) Needs

- **Security.** The current system meets or exceeds state security standards. Tampering with the county’s closed system and rudimentary technology is difficult and, by experience, nonexistent. The technology and administrative procedures provide for ample checks and balances and exhaustive accuracy testing and auditing. As such, equipment tampering, equipment malfunctions, and operator error are easy to detect and isolate. Since votes are recorded on paper and electronically, vote totals are easy to verify and inconsistencies can be corrected on Election Day or during a recount or contest. If possible, future voting systems and methods should improve upon the security of the current system. But at very least a new system should ensure that current level of security is maintained.

- **Ease of Use for Poll Workers.** The current system is exceedingly difficult for poll workers to assemble, initiate, shut down, and disassemble. A new system should attempt to drastically simplify and improve voting machine initiation and shut down operations. By contrast, (once initiated) it is easy and quick for many voters to vote using the current optical scan ballot card voting methods and technology. The ease and quickness of voting and casting a ballot is essential to maximizing the voting capacity of every voting location and mitigating the risk of long lines that dissuade or effectively prevent voters from voting on Election Day.

- **Ease of Use for Voters.** The ease and quickness for most voters in the current system should be maintained or improved upon in a potential new system. The current DRE touchscreen voting apparatus, the HAVA compliant system for voters with disabilities, is not as fast or intuitive as optical scan ballot card voting. The audio ballot capabilities of the current system are legally compliant, but exceedingly slow and cumbersome to operate by voters and poll workers. This should be improved in a potential new system. To the extent DRE touchscreen and audio ballot voting play a larger role in future voting, an optimal number of additional voting machines (i.e. more than one per precinct/location) should be procured and utilized in each location to lessen the effects of the slower rate of vote casting.

- **Accuracy.** The current system produces accurate results. There have been no reported or experienced instances of the county’s current machines having mis-tabulated properly marked ballots without there being some form of operator error or easily detectable and alerted equipment malfunction. The current system also has adequate safeguards to alert voters and election officials of operator errors and system malfunctions and to prevent such anomalies from affecting other properly recorded ballots and votes. A potential new system should maintain current accuracy levels.

- **Accessible (HAVA Compliant).** All voting systems approved for use in Indiana are HAVA compliant and provide at least a minimum standard of accessible, confidential, and independent voting for voters with disabilities. A potential new voting system should improve accessibility for voters with disabilities to the greatest extent reasonably possible. Under HAVA, a new system must include some form of direct electronic balloting. The inclusion of the DRE components/capabilities in a new voting system should be integrated seamlessly with the system as a whole, as opposed to awkwardly combining two separate systems as is the current case. The speed and intuitiveness of the audio ballot capability in a potential new system should be improved over the current system to the greatest extent reasonably possible. For many voters with disabilities, traveling to a polling location to vote is an activity outside their normal routine that requires, planning, preparations, and perhaps some level of anxiety. To the extent technology can be used to ensure ample and consistent time, space, and flexibility in a supportive but non-patronizing manner, it should. Generally speaking, the greater the level of respect, ease and comfort provided to voters with disabilities, the less likely voters will experience a voting hardship.
• **Adaptable.** The county’s current voting system has limited flexibility to accommodate potential changes to election law and voting methods. Elections are often different and may require different capabilities from one to the next. Election laws and mandated voting methods are also ever-evolving. A potential new voting system should be adaptable to accommodate the current precinct-based voting methods, as well as central absentee counting, vote centers and other potential new voting methods. The capability of a single machine to tabulate every ballot style for the county’s current 600 precincts is particularly important in this regard.

**Types of Voting Systems**

- **“Paper-Trail” Systems.** Some voting systems record tabulated votes in two forms: electronically and on paper. These systems are attractive to voters and other stakeholders because votes are recorded and stored in two independent locations and formats. This permits audits to be performed and system accuracy to be easily verified or challenged in a recount. It also provides a back up record should one set of stored vote data be (intentionally or unintentionally) erased or corrupted. However, the use of paper-based ballot records necessitates ongoing printing, retention, and disposal costs. Pre-printing ballots before an election facilitates expeditious Election Day voting, but results in printing more ballots than those cast as state law requires one printed ballot per registered voter in a general election. Pre-printing and sorting ballots by precinct is complicated and can lead to administrative mistakes and corrective measures. Also, it is not generally an accessible or HAVA-compliant method of voting. Collating ballots after the polls close can be time consuming. Though more efficient, more reliable, and potentially easier to organize, “on-demand” printing either before voting or as a result of votes being cast still necessitates additional printer hardware and ongoing printing and special programming costs. Many Study Group members expressed a desire for any new voting system to provide some form of verifiable and reviewable paper record of votes cast. They also expressed the need to maintain ballot secrecy and voter confidentiality. The current system provides a verifiable paper record and maintains ballot secrecy. Other group members favored eliminating paper due to its functional redundancy, inflexibility, inefficiencies, and ongoing costs. These members recognized the potential for voters to have less comfort and faith in such a system, but predicted that voters’ comfort level would rise over time.

- **Electronic-Only (Paperless) System.** Some Study Group members felt the voting public would generally distrust electronic-only voting systems which would lead to less confidence in the system. Members recognized that some voters may have limited exposure to technology and find it difficult to use. Members also acknowledged that the public’s general exposure to technology was increasing among all age groups, which decreases this risk as time passes. Lacking a hard paper trail, members questioned the availability of back-up or corrective measures if the system would fail or electronic data were lost. Members questioned the ability of electronic systems to be infiltrated without alert and how easily or successfully a recount could be performed. Members also hesitated about the potential that electronic systems may be more expensive to purchase initially and maintain and replace over time. There was general consensus, however, that the use of electronic systems as a “front-end” voting input method was preferable given its greater accessibility for voters with disabilities, and that the ability of a system to also provide an individualized, secret, and cost effective paper record of a ballot on the back-end was preferred.
Should the County Purchase New Voting Equipment in 2014?

- **Yes.** Study Group members felt that the purchase of new voting equipment in 2014 to replace the old system was justified generally. The current equipment is outdated. To utilize the current system going forward, there will be significant upgrades necessary, including the procurement of machines capable of counting ballots from multiple precincts at a time. SB621 recently passed by the Indiana legislature very likely requires the purchase of new voting hardware because the county cannot reasonably comply with its requirements (i.e. central count of absentee) without new equipment. There have been advances in technology that would be beneficial, especially with respect to security. The integrity and security of electronic systems in particular are improving. The current system’s technological obsolescence makes it increasingly difficult to find replacement parts to repair and maintain current machines.

- **No.** Other members recognized that election technology and methods continue to rapidly evolve and systems that are currently available and certified could quickly become obsolete and more suitable systems may become available after 2014. Members also recognized that the availability of funding is a significant and perhaps prohibitive road-block to purchasing new equipment in 2014. Advancements in newer technology may not justify the added expense.

- **Consensus.** Whether to purchase new equipment in 2014 depends, in part, on the ability of the county to fund the purchase. However, the current system is obsolete; at some point in the near term the county will need to purchase a new voting system. The Study Group would prefer the replacement to take place before widespread problems begin to occur using the current aging system and would like to avoid continued investment in an obsolete system that will need to be replaced at some point in the near future.

Should electronic poll books (“ePollbooks”) be purchased?

Consensus was not achieved as to whether ePollbooks should be part of an eventual equipment purchase. However, there was general recognition that the use of electronic pollbooks instead of printed paper poll books could create greater efficiencies and perhaps increase the speed and workflow of poll workers in processing voter information on and after Election Day.

Although it eliminates the cost of printing and post-election processing of paper pollbooks, ePollbooks would require new initial capital expenses as well as ongoing programming and maintenance costs. There were also concerns voiced that the system could be “hacked” given that ePollbooks in Indiana must have the capability of being connected to a central server via the internet when used in a Vote Center environment. (Central server connectivity is not required when using ePollbooks in a precinct-based environment as voters can only vote in their home precinct on Election Day.) Additionally, many polling locations in Marion County may lack the IT infrastructure for ePollbooks to connect to the Internet or maintain a connection through the voting day.

To the extent the Election Board would eventually use an ePollbook system, it should be designed and utilized in a way to mitigate these concerns to the greatest extent reasonably possible. Under current law, ePollbooks must be powerfully encrypted throughout any transmission of information from the ePollbook to and from a central server, thus reducing the ability to infiltrate and corrupt information being transferred. A potential future ePollbook system should also be easy, intuitive, and non-intimidating for poll workers and voters to use. It should minimize training time and operator errors as much as reasonably possible. Members would be open to a low-cost “pilot” ePollbook program that might test the use of ePollbooks in a limited number of precincts in Marion County.
Polling Sites

In Indiana, the county executive selects polling locations pursuant to state law, not the bi-partisan Election Board. Under Marion County’s UniGov statute, the Mayor of Indianapolis is the county executive and therefore is responsible for selecting the sites where voters vote on Election Day.

- **Accessibility.** All voting locations must be as completely accessible to all voters as is reasonably possible with the following considerations:
  - Plentiful parking. There must be enough spaces for voters as well as for the normal business operations of the facility throughout Election Day. This includes spaces for voters and poll workers with disabilities near the entrance where voting occurs.
  - Smooth Ingress/Egress. There must be curb cuts, ramps, thresholds and door accessibility for voters with disabilities that take voters seamlessly from available parking spaces, on to curbs, and into and out of the buildings, especially for those using wheelchairs and scooters. The voting entrance and exit must also be clearly marked and visible to voters.
  - Voting space. In recent years, many locations lack sufficient space for voting to occur on Election Day. Polling locations must be large enough to handle the volume of voters, particularly when more than one precinct is assigned to a site. Care must be given to ensure plentiful space to navigate around poll worker tables, voting machines and voting booths. There should be tables with adequate height, width, and depth to allow clearance for various types of wheelchairs and scooters so voters utilizing these tools need not stand or move to a different chair.
  - Amenities. There must be accessible amenities for poll workers and voters within the location, including spacious and accessible restroom facilities and water fountains.

- **Familiarity.** The familiarity and proximity of a voting location to a voter’s residence is an important factor and can facilitate the options, planning, and procurement of transportation for voters (especially those with disabilities) to and from the voting location.

- **Consistency.** Consistency in site selections is strongly preferred; locations should not change year to year or, much worse, election to election. This causes confusion and increases the number of uncountable provisional ballots each election when voters present themselves to vote at the incorrect location. Voters should be made aware of any change in polling locations whenever possible. Changes to voting locations create significant hardships for voters with disabilities, especially those with visual and mobility impairments. A new polling location to such voters means that the voter must plan and prepare for new possible contingencies with respect to the physical plant and layout of a new facility.

- **Care and cooperation.** Careful evaluation and consideration of location placement must be made by the Mayor’s office to ensure poll workers and voters can walk to sites if needed and have access to public transportation. The Mayor’s office, Election Board, and facility owners should coordinate and cooperate to ensure the needs of voters, election officials, and the facility are met. Revisions to voting facility contracts should occur to facilitate greater communication, cooperation, and understanding between officials and facilities.
Poll Workers

- **Training.** Poll worker training would be significantly enhanced by a transition to a more user friendly and intuitive voting system. Machine set-up, operation, and shut-down training necessarily predominates current training due to the complexity of the current system. A simpler system would allow the Election Board to focus more on process and reduce the anxiety of poll workers.

- **Familiarity.** Study Group members expressed that familiarity and consistency of poll workers at precinct polling sites creates a welcoming environment for voters.

- **Checks and Balances.** Precinct-based voting model requires checks and balances between the political parties as state law clearly defines the involvement of the major political parties. Both parties select poll workers and appoint them to work at a specific location. There is less guidance under the state’s Vote Center law with respect to political party involvement and requires the Election Board to make that determination in their Vote Center plan.

- **Early Voting Eases Pressure.** More early voting opportunities alleviate long lines on Election Day, and puts less stress on poll workers and the site itself.

Vote Centers

The study group was introduced to and exhaustively educated about the new Vote Center model of voting recently made available statewide in Indiana. There was no consensus among the group, however, that Marion County should transition to Vote Center voting. Attractive features include the ability of voters to vote at any voting location and the possibility (without any assurances) that the Vote Center model could result in lower costs in the long-term. Yet many election administrators using Vote Centers caution that initial capital costs are significant.

Marion County’s current voting system does not work in a Vote Center environment. The M100 optical scan machine cannot hold or tabulate the ballot styles needed for the county’s 600 precincts and the county does not own enough iVotronic touchscreen machines to make the transition feasible. Additionally, Marion County would have to purchase ePollbooks and ensure every site could maintain consistent connectivity to a central server to ensure a person could not vote more than once on Election Day.

As was noted by Ball State University’s Bowen Center on Public Affairs, Vote Centers could provide greater accessibility to voters with disabilities because those voters would have the ability to choose their own voting facility based on physical accessibility and accommodations and/or its familiarity to the voter. Vote Centers may also have better trained and more accommodating poll workers. Also, a potential consolidation of voting locations over time could increase the percentage and degree to which polling sites are fully accessible to voters with disabilities.

However, Marion County’s high population and urban density largely throughout the county does not necessarily lend itself to a Vote Center model. Unlike current and “pilot” Vote Center counties in Indiana, Marion County does not have large rural areas with a handful of municipal centers. In those counties, rural residents were familiar with and used to traveling large distances to vote, transact business, and engage in public life prior to switching to Vote Centers.

Additionally, Marion County has by far the largest number of registered voters than any other county in Indiana. In Marion County, available polling locations are already at or above capacity. Consolidating voting locations and personnel would add more voters into already full voting locations. This could cause exceedingly long lines and other
undue hardships on voters and ultimately reduce voting in Marion County. Moreover, the current voting system (including the use of paper pollbooks) is not technologically capable of accommodating a Vote Center model.

The concept that fewer poll workers and lower costs would follow if the county were to switch to Vote Centers is speculative and would depend completely on the number of Vote Centers chosen. It is also likely that more technologically-sophisticated poll workers would be necessary to run a Vote Center and the county may need to re-evaluate poll worker pay as a result.

Lastly, complete cooperation between the major political parties is required to implement Vote Centers. There must unanimous agreement as to the locations of each Vote Center, the number and location of early voting satellite locations, the selection of poll workers and leadership at each location, and numerous other historically contentious issues between the political parties.

Early Voting

The Study Group worked hard to avoid politically contentious topics and debates throughout this project, including expanding in-person early voting options. This topic is particularly controversial in Marion County given highly-charged emotions and rhetoric on both sides of the issue. However, it cannot be denied that early absentee voting in whatever form enhances many features of any voting system or method described above. Below are some consensus points of the Study Group as it relates to early voting:

- **Flexibility.** Early voting represents the greatest flexibility for voters. During this 28-day period, every properly registered voter go to any early voting site regardless of where s/he resides and vote when their schedule permits – not just during a 12-hour period on Election Day. In addition to making the Clerk’s Office available to early voters, local Election Boards can open additional early voting sites to meet the demands of voters (assuming its members can reach unanimous agreement). Many jurisdictions that offer expanded early voting locations see greater participation in their elections and much of the stress on Election Day poll workers and locations is significantly reduced.

- **Accessibility.** Early voting provides greater accessibility for all voters, especially those with disabilities as they can base the decision of where they want to vote on the facility’s accessibility, accommodations, and amenities. It also provides voters with substantially more time to plan and schedule (and potentially reschedule, if necessary) their confidential and independent voting experience over a number of days rather than within a limited number of hours on Election Day.

- **Security.** Absentee applications, envelopes, and voter registration information for absentee ballots are reviewed three to four times, sometimes even after voters presented valid photo ID at in-person early voting locations. Arguably, early absentee ballots are scrutinized far more than those cast on Election Day.

- **Poll workers.** Early voting assists poll workers by reducing their per-location Election Day work load. It reduces overall Election Day staffing needs at polling location and lines of voters at polling sites. Post-election administrative and ballot accounting tasks at voting locations are also decreased.

- **Vote Centers.** Successful Vote Center models include a significantly expanded early voting effort. Indeed, Indiana law requires additional early voting sites to be part of the county’s Vote Center plan. Group members heard from jurisdictions like Travis County, Texas and Tippecanoe County, Indiana where they had 23 and 19 static early voting sites plus mobile sites in the 2012 Presidential Election, respectively. As a result, about 67% of Travis County voters and about 40% of Tippecanoe Count voters voted before Election Day. Clearly, this reduces stress on the polling locations or Vote Centers on Election Day and reduces the need for Election Day poll workers, machines, and other resources.
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1. WELCOME
2. MISSION STATEMENT
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Welcome

• Study Group Members
  ○ Marion County Democratic Party
  ○ Marion County Republican Party
  ○ Marion County Libertarian Party
  ○ Marion County Board of Voter Registration
  ○ Indianapolis-Marion County City-County Council
  ○ Marion County Office of Finance & Management
  ○ Marion County Information Services Agency
  ○ Greater Indianapolis NAACP
  ○ League of Women Voters of Indianapolis
  ○ Central Indiana Council on Aging

  • Ball State University’s Bowen Center on Public Affairs
    ○ Dr. Raymond Scheele
    ○ Greg Fehribach
    ○ Susan Sizemore, consultant
  • Staff
    ○ Election Board Team
    ○ Carolyn Brown, facilitator

Why are we meeting?

• Aging Fleet of Voting Equipment
  ○ Purchased in 2002; 2000 model technology
  ○ Replacement parts becoming difficult to find
  ○ Equipment showing signs of age

  • Tabulation software license expires 12/2014
  • Machine service contract expires 12/2014

How we vote on Election Day will in large part determine the type and quantity of voting equipment needed in Marion County to run future elections

Voter Experience Project

• Phase 1: Study Group
  ○ Review & study Indiana voting methods
  ○ Draft a well-informed, fully deliberated report identifying the cost and benefits of Marion County’s future voting needs
    ○ Report largely based on your input and reaction to information, so your participation is important!
  ○ Present those findings to the Election Board
• Phase 2: Community Input
  ○ Allow Indianapolis residents to add their voice to the final report
Focus on Election Day Voting Methods

- Series of presentations to learn more about:
  - Election Fundamentals & Indiana Voting Methods
  - General Procedures & Poll Workers
  - Voting Technology
  - Security Needs
  - Cost
- Not focusing on:
  - Campaign Finance
  - Candidate Filing
  - Voter ID
  - Voter Registration Requirements
  - Current Process
  - Controversies

Study Group Mission Statement

Mission: To present a well informed, fully deliberated report identifying the cost and benefits of Marion County’s future voting needs, and present those findings to the Election Board.

When are elections held in Indiana?

- Non-Presidential Federal Election (2014)
  - Includes federal offices and state, county and township executive and legislative offices
- Municipal Election (2015)
  - Local ‘city’ elections – Mayor, City-County Council
- Presidential Federal Election (2016)
  - Includes federal offices and state, county and township executive and legislative offices
- ‘Off year’ – no elections (2017)

When are elections held?

- Referenda/Public Questions
  - Constitutional amendments
  - Certain controlled building projects where tax dollars are used
  - Questions adopted by the Indiana Legislature
- Special Elections
  - Called when certain vacancies exist
    - Example: 2008 Special Election to fill the seat vacated with the passing of Congresswoman Julia Carson
  - Called by special legislation
    - Example: 2009 Wishard referendum election

What are the types of elections?

- Primary Election
  - Different dates across the country
  - Indiana holds its primary elections on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in May
  - Opportunity for two major political parties to nominate their candidates for the fall election
  - Indiana voters must choose a Democrat or Republican ballot – can’t vote in both
  - How election code determines party affiliation

Presenter: Andy Mallon, Election Board Attorney
What are the types of elections?
- General Election
  - Date is the same across the country
  - First Tuesday after the first Monday in November
  - Voters decide who will govern for next term of years
  - Nominated candidates from the two major political parties, other third parties and opportunities to write-in candidates appear on the same ballot
- Who funds elections?
  - Indiana law requires the local unit of government to fund most elections
    - In Marion County, the county general fund is used to pay for each election
      - For large equipment purchases, a bond is often issued to cover the cost of capital expenses (i.e. machines, hardware, etc.)
      - Service and software expenses are generally handled through contractual agreements
    - Referenda elections not held in regularly scheduled election year are paid by the party requesting the election
      - Example: 2009 Referenda Election was paid for by Wishard Hospital and the few township school corporations with additional public questions

What agencies take part in local elections?
- Marion County Election Board
  - Bi-partisan board made up of three members:
    - 1 Republican, 1 Democrat, County Clerk
- Marion County Board of Voters Registration
  - Bi-partisan staff with co-directors appointed by the two major political parties
- County Executive
  - In Marion County, the Mayor is the county executive pursuant to state law
    - In most jurisdictions, the County Commissioners serve this function

What is the Election Board?
- Bi-partisan Board made up of three members
  - 1 Democrat & 1 Republican are appointed by their party chair
  - County Clerk (elected)
- Manages Election Day operations and absentee voting activities
- Supports political parties’ efforts to recruit and train poll workers
- Prints ballots
- Maintains and tests voting equipment and software
- Tabulates and certifies election results

What is the Role of the County Clerk?
- Determines partisan majority of the Board
- Drafts and administers Election Board budget
- Performs election education and outreach
- Maintains filings, election results and other records
- Supervises staff

County’s Chief Election Official
What is the Board of Voters Registration?

- Bi-partisan Board where co-directors are appointed by the two major political parties
- Not all Indiana counties have a separate Voter Registration Board; most under the direction of County Clerk
- Accepts and maintains county voter registration records and updates the Statewide Voter Registration System (SVRS)
- Builds the ‘precinct key’
  - Assigns voters & precincts to correct election districts
  - Used by Election Board to build ballots for each precinct
- Prints Election Day poll books for each precinct
  - Poll book is the list of all registered voters in a precinct

What does the county executive do?

- Under the UniGov statute, Indianapolis Mayor is the county executive
- Selects polling locations that are accessible to all voters
- Draws precinct lines

What is a precinct?

- All voters live in a precinct
  - Generally 2-5 square city blocks
  - Board of Voters Registration assigns voters and election districts to each precinct
- All election districts and government jurisdictions are made up of contiguous precincts
- Sometimes precincts are ‘split’ by smaller election districts
  - Term used internally to denote precincts that are split in two, three or four

How are precincts drawn?

- County executive draws precinct boundary lines by grouping together census blocks
  - Census blocks are even smaller than precincts and help define the demographics of an area
- Generally, any changes in precinct maps goes through a public process and vetted by Indiana Election Commission
  - Special law permitted the county executive to redraw maps without public input and review by the Indiana Election Commission in 2011 only

Marion County’s Precincts

- Marion County has 600 precincts
  - Prior to 2007, county had 917 precincts
  - Bi-partisan reduction of precincts to 590 implemented 12/07
  - Mayor Ballard redrew precincts in ’11 & increased to 600

How are ballots defined?

- Ballot card*
  - Ballot printed on paper, which can be read through an optical scan reader
  - Voter marks the paper to indicate their selections
  - *This will be the definition used throughout our conversation
- Paper ballot
  - Used when an election is hand-counted
- DRE (Direct Recording Electronic)
  - Ballot displayed electronically on a computer screen
  - Voting activated by poll worker
  - Voter uses button or touch screen to mark selections and cast ballot, which is stored in electronic media
**How are ballots built?**

- Each precinct’s “Precinct Definition” found in the “Precinct Key” identifies each legislative and government unit assigned to a particular precinct
  - Example: Precinct Key defines precinct A as having President, US Senator and dog catcher only; this means the ballot in this precinct will be printed with just those three offices on it
- Candidate filing opens each election cycle
  - Candidates are certified by either the Indiana Election Division or county Election Board
  - Certified candidates placed on ballot in their respective election districts within each precinct
- Order of races and candidates determined by statute

**How many ballots are printed?**

- **Primary Elections**
  - Require separate Democrat & Republican ballots
    - Special 17-year old ballots are printed in those precincts where a final election occurs like precinct committeeperson
  - Formula outlined in state law to determine number of each partisan ballot to print for each precinct
  - If public question considered in a primary, must also print a special non-partisan ballot to permit voting only on the question
- **General Elections**
  - One ballot printed for each voter in a precinct

**What do poll workers do?**

- Manage Election Day polling sites
- Process voters into the poll book
- Ensure each voter receives the correct ballot
  - Often there are several ballot styles in a precinct, which requires the poll worker to select the right ballot
- Initiate and shut-down voting equipment
  - Assist with operations if necessary
- Enforce elections laws to protect voters & prevent fraud
- Decide challenges when necessary
- Process absentee ballots

**What are watchers & challengers?**

- **Watchers**
  - Appointed by political parties, candidates or other groups designated by statute (e.g. media)
  - Permitted at a precinct on Election Day 30 minutes before polls open through completion of results tabulation
  - May come and go throughout the day
  - May watch and inspect precinct activities and paperwork
- **Challengers**
  - Appointed by political parties
    - Must be a registered voter of the county
  - May be present 30 minutes before polls open through close
  - May challenge voters under penalty of perjury, if otherwise qualified under state law
**What are provisional ballots?**

- Ballot of last resort used to allow the Election Board to review challenges or problems like:
  - Voter at incorrect precinct
  - Person not registered but wants to vote
  - Voter lacking appropriate ID
  - Can bring ID to Election Board by noon ten days after Election Day
- Voter & poll workers/challenger must complete an affidavit & sign the security envelope
  - Ballot has a special sticker placed on it and is secured in envelope
- Election Board investigates and makes determination if a provisional ballot can be counted

**What are voter registration requirements?**

- Must be a citizen of the United States
- Must be 18 on or before the date of November’s general election
  - Indiana law permits 17-year-olds to register and vote in the primary election as long as they are 18 by general election
- Must reside in precinct for 30 days
- Cannot currently be serving a prison sentence

*In the November 2012 presidential election, Marion County had 640,675 registered voters*

**How are voters defined?**

- **Active voter**
  - Voter has registered or voted in any election during the preceding 4 years at their registration address; OR
  - Voter has NOT voted by has responded in writing to an address confirmation notice sent
- **Inactive voter**
  - Voter has not voted in preceding 4 years and did NOT respond within 30 days to an address confirmation notice

**Indiana Voting Methods**

**PRECINCT-BASED ELECTIONS**

**VOTE CENTERS**

**When & where do we vote in Indiana?**

- **Absentee Voting**
  - Mail
  - Traveling Board
  - Early Voting
    - In-person at Clerk’s Office and satellite locations
- **On Election Day**
  - Precinct Polling Location
  - Vote Center

**Absentee Voting**

- **Mail**
  - Voter must apply for a ballot in every election, providing a reason for the request
  - Applications processed by Election Board staff and ballots mailed to voter, if approved
  - Voter must return the ballot on or before Election Day
- **Traveling Board**
  - Only voters with disabilities, those confined to their home or care facility and their caregivers can access this option
  - Bi-partisan team brings the voter’s ballot to them and can provide assistance, if requested
Absentee Voting

- **Early Voting**
  - Option available to all voters 29 days before Election Day in the Clerk’s Office
  - Additional satellite locations permitted under law
  - Satellite early voting is often confused with vote centers – while similar, they should not be used interchangeably
  - No reason necessary to vote early in-person, but must present valid photo ID that complies with Indiana law
  - Ends at noon the Monday before Election Day

Voting on Election Day

- **Polls are open in Indiana between 6AM & 6PM**
  - Time varies from state to state
- **Precinct-based elections**
  - Voter votes at a site in or near their neighborhood
  - Voting sites selected by the county executive & are subject to change each election
  - **Vote Center**
    - Voter votes anywhere in the county
    - Sites must be unanimously selected by the Election Board through its Vote Center Plan

Precinct-based Elections

- **Polling Locations**
  - Found within or near the boundaries of a precinct as required by state law
  - Often multiple precincts are assigned to the same site
  - County executive selects the locations
    - Must submit the list no later than 29 days before each election
  - Sites subject to change in each election

Precinct-based Elections

- **Poll Workers**
  - Up to five per precinct as outlined in state law
    - Inspector (1)
    - Judge (2 – 1D & 1R)
    - Clerk (2 – 1D & 1R)
  - Sometimes, assistant poll clerks are permitted if Board adopts a resolution before an election
  - Political parties recruit and appoint poll workers with assistance from the Election Board
    - Parties must submit their lists of poll workers no later than 21 days before an election
    - Student poll worker program permits 16 & 17 year-olds to work if they meet a set of criteria

Precinct-Based Elections

- **Absentee Voting**
  - Mail & Traveling Board are treated the same under both models
  - Early in-person voting is available for 29 days
    - Any additional ‘satellite’ early voting sites must be unanimously approved by the Election Board
    - County decides absentee ballot processing method
    - Central Count – absentee votes are counted at a central site by bi-partisan teams
    - After another set of bi-partisan commissioners are dispatched to precincts with a list of absentee voters to check the poll book
  - Precinct Count – bi-partisan teams deliver absentee ballots to each precinct where poll workers process into the poll book and feed ballots into the machine
  - Absentee ballots can be received up to the last delivery before 6PM
    - Marion County pursues a court order in each election to permit any ballot received by 6PM and not arriving at precinct through no fault of the voter be counted during canvassing

Precinct-Based Elections

- **Voting Technology**
  - Requires printed poll book
    - ePollbooks currently not permitted under this voting model
  - Pending legislation would permit all counties to use them
  - Voting Machines
    - Decision of ‘how many’ aided by precinct parameter of about 1,200 registered voters in a precinct
      - Currently, Marion County has:
        - at least one iVotronic at each polling site (Direct Recording Electronic)
        - one M100 in each precinct (optical scan ballot reader)
      - Other technology options available
  - Election Board required to hold a public test of equipment no later than 14 days before an election
**Precinct-Based Elections**

- **Ballot Printing**
  - DRE (iVotronic in Marion County)
    - No printed ballots
    - Ballots stored electronically on Personalized Electronic Ballot card
  - Paper Ballots
    - Can be programmed by style or precinct
      - *By style* gives the Election Board more flexibility to share ballots between precincts to troubleshoot on Election Day and find some small cost savings
      - Programming ballots *by precinct* is more inflexible as ballots can only be used in one precinct
      - Some precincts are split, requiring multiple ballots in each precinct

- **Processing Election Day Voters**
  - Voter must go to the correct precinct within their polling location
  - Voter presents photo ID to poll workers
  - Clerks find voter in the poll book and voter signs their name
  - Voter receives a paper ballot initialed by the clerks or a card noting their precinct and ballot style to be found on the DRE
  - Voter completes and casts their ballot

- **After the polls close**
  - Individual precinct results printed at the polling location & signed off by poll workers
  - Electronic media (flash cards) removed from equipment & are later uploaded to a central server
  - Poll workers perform an accounting of the precinct’s ballots, secure their materials & deliver to Election Board

**Precinct-Based Elections**

- **Recount**
  - Candidates have to ask for specific precincts to be counted
    - Precinct-based elections force poll workers to organize and bundle individual precinct materials like:
      - Poll book
      - Ballots
      - Results tape
      - Ballots (ballot cards & electronic media) and materials are returned and stored in individual precinct containers and held in the Board’s vault to be reviewed by parties of a recount in order to determine the intent of the voter

**Vote Centers**

- **Polling Locations**
  - Voter can vote at any site in the county
  - Indiana law requires 1 vote center for every 10,000 active voters, rounding up for any partial number
  - In 2012 General Election, there were 637,820 active voters
  - Sites designated in the county’s vote center plan
  - No distance requirements or parameters in the law
  - Sites subject to change only if plan is amended by a unanimous vote of the Election Board
- **Poll Workers**
  - Designation determined in plan unanimously adopted by the Election Board
  - State law does not require a minimum number or define party representation
  - Two major political parties are required to recruit

**Vote Centers**

- **Absentee Voting**
  - Mail & Traveling Board are treated the same under both models
  - Early in-person voting available for 29 days
    - Vote center plan requires at least one site be used as a satellite early voting location for two Saturdays
  - All absentee ballots must be centrally counted
    - Absentees are counted at a central site by bi-partisan teams
    - Must receive absentee ballot by noon
- **Voting Technology**
  - Requires ePollbook
    - Ensures each voter only votes once as the equipment is networked together and shares the same database
  - Voting machines
    - Difficult to determine number of voters that will attempt to vote at each site
    - Turnout will not be uniform across the county
    - Challenging to move equipment around on Election Day to meet demand at unexpected high volume sites
    - Challenges with current equipment
      - Marion County does not own enough touch-screen machines to meet voter needs
      - County’s current M100 technology does not work in a vote center model
      - Does not have the capacity to read, tabulate & store information from all 600 precincts
Vote Centers

- Ballot Printing
  - DRE
    - Printed ballots not necessary
    - Other jurisdictions do print paper ballots as back-up, however
  - Paper Ballots
    - Would have to be programmed & printed by precinct
    - Ballots could be pre-printed or printed on-demand though pre-printed ballots would require site to have storage for at least 600 ballot styles in a general election, 1200 in a primary election

- Processing Election Day Voters
  - Voter can go to any vote center in the county
  - Voter presents photo ID to poll workers
  - Clerks looks up voter in ePollbook
    - ePollbooks connected to prevent voter from voting more than once
  - Voter signs a log book or signature can be electronically captured with a signature pad
  - Voter receives a paper ballot or a card noting their precinct to find on the DRE
  - Voter completes and casts their ballot

- After polls close
  - Electronic media returned & results uploaded to a central server
  - Vote Center Plan would outline how materials would be organized

- Recounts
  - Candidates must ask for specific precincts
  - May be difficult to organize materials
    - If paper ballots used, each vote center would have to sort at least 600 ballot styles
    - Electronic ballots make this easier, but are concerns about verifiable voter paper audit trail

Vote Center Plan

- County must adopt a vote center plan:
  - State law outlines what information needs to be in the plan (see handout)
  - Draft plan must be presented at a public hearing
  - Thirty days after the hearing on the draft plan, Board must hold another hearing to adopt the plan
    - Requires unanimous vote of the Election Board
    - Plan in effect until rescinded or amended by unanimous vote
  - County executive and fiscal body must each pass a resolution designating the county as a vote center county
    - Simply majority required

Data

Large Jurisdictions by Population & Registered Voters (2012 General)*

*LA City runs their own elections and November 2009 Municipal was the most recent.
Comparable Jurisdictions by Population & Registered Voters (2012 General)

Indiana Jurisdictional Comparison

Registered Voters: Top 4 Indiana Counties

Observations

• Marion County has 15% of all registered voters in Indiana
  ○ Lake County is next largest and represents 7% of Indiana voters
  ○ 4,554,289 represents total number of registered voters in Indiana as of 10/29/12
• Combined total of all registered voters living in the 8 vote center counties only compromises 77% of the total voters in Marion County

Observations

• Marion County’s population density and urban environment present unique challenges to election administrators
  ○ Consider looking at other comparable jurisdictions across the country for best practices for both models – precinct-based and voter center – for potential application in new generation of Marion County voting system
Discussion

RESPONSES ON THE FOLLOWING THREE SLIDES FROM STUDY GROUP MEMBERS TAKEN AT THE APRIL 15, 2013 MEETING

Presented: Carolyn Brown, facilitator

What are your constituent goals?

- Make it easier, more convenient
- Fundamental fairness in the process
- Hard copy vote trail
- Short or long-term fiscal impact to the county
- Informed and fiscally responsible decision in elections & voting technology to do so

Presenters: Carolyn Brown, facilitator

What new information did you hear tonight?

- Cost & complexity of vote centers
- Lack of clarity in the statute for vote centers
- Three-member Board ultimate direct decision – their authority & oversight

What topics need further discussion or explanation?

- Did not have time to discuss

Next Meeting

MONDAY, APRIL 29 | 5:30 PM
PUBLIC ASSEMBLY ROOM
CITY-COUNTY BUILDING
VOTER EXPERIENCE PROJECT

GENERAL PROTOCOLS &
ABSENTEE BALLOT PROCESSING

AGENDA
1. WELCOME
2. FOLLOW-UP
3. GENERAL ELECTION DAY PROCEDURES
4. ABSENTEE BALLOT PROCESSING
5. DISCUSSION

Welcome

WHAT ARE YOUR CONSTITUENT GOALS?

• Make voting easier, more convenient & accessible while ensuring fundamental fairness
• Process needs to be secure with a verifiable ballot audit trail
• Examine the short- and long-term fiscal impact of the new system

WHAT NEW INFORMATION DID YOU LEARN?

• Comparison of precinct-based and vote center voting models
• Cost and complexity of managing elections
• Responsibility of the various city-county partners involved in local election administration

TOPICS NEEDING FURTHER DISCUSSION

• Technology & security
• Cost
• Feedback from other vote center jurisdictions
Provisional Ballot Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2010 General</th>
<th>2011 Municipal</th>
<th>2012 General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not in Poll Book/No Fail Safe</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Moved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ID</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add’t Docs Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature Mismatch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not 18 y/o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong Precinct</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong County</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Registered</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollworker Error</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>282</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2002 Voting Equipment Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting Equipment &amp; Accessories</td>
<td>$6,916,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Support Services</td>
<td>$2,698,638.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Agreement</td>
<td>$746,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES&amp;S Software License Fees</td>
<td>$102,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Items*</td>
<td>$21,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,484,818.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tabulation equipment and network (e.g., server, laptops, workstations)

General Procedures

PROCESSING VOTERS AND ADMINISTERING ELECTIONS UNDER A PRECINCT-BASED & VOTE CENTER MODEL ELECTIONS

Presenter: Andy Mallon, Election Board Attorney
Greg Fehribach, Ball State University’s Bowen Center on Public Affairs

What do poll workers do?

- **Inspector (1)**
  - Manages the precinct
  - Ensures the site is open at 6AM
  - Picks up Election Day materials from Election Board Regional Site
  - Directs poll workers
  - Assists voters

- **Judge (2 – 1D & 1R)**
  - Assists voters
  - Checks ID

- **Clerks (2 – 1D & 1R)**
  - Manages poll book, the list of every registered voter in a precinct
  - Checks ID
  - Determines proper ballot style for voters and responsible for ballot control
  - Processes absentee ballots with assistance from the other poll workers
Who appoints the poll workers?

- Inspectors in Marion County appointed by the Democratic Party
  - State law outlines the process: political party of the Secretary of State candidate that wins your county (NOT the overall election) gets to appoint until the next SOS election
- State law requires the two major political parties appoint Judges & Clerks
  - Parties generally ask precinct committeepersons to fill slots
- Election Board recruits additional poll workers to fill open positions

Poll Workers: Vote Center

- County’s Vote Center Plan outlines the number & types of poll workers
  - State law does NOT set minimum or maximum requirements
  - Examples from other Indiana Vote Center counties:
    - Vanderburgh County (2011 Plan)
      - 1 Inspector, 4 Judges (2D & 2R), 4 Clerks (2D & 2R)
    - Tippecanoe County (2006 Plan)
      - 1 Supervisor/Inspector, Greeters, Exit Greeters, Check-in Judges, Programming Judges, Provisional Team, Hold Back Team
    - Floyd County (2012 Plan)
      - At least 1 Inspector, 2 Judges (1D & 1R), 2 Clerks (1D & 1R)

Other Election Day Support Needs

- Hotline Operators
  - Election Board (30-50)
    - Field calls from poll workers and voters at a centralized location
    - Early morning busiest time, as team is making sure all sites are opening on time, dispatching back-up poll workers and answering questions about voting equipment set-up
    - Log issues into EBIRS, Election Board Incident Reporting Software
  - Voter Registration (15-20)
    - Fields calls from poll workers and voters from a centralized location to help determine voter’s eligibility
    - Issues certificates of error if a person has been accidentally left off the poll book
    - Confirms whether or not a person is registered to vote
Other Election Day Support Needs

- Support teams are needed under both voting models
  - How many and where they are located may be different – for example:
    - There are 25 mechanics on routes under our current system to address voting equipment issues (each mechanic covers about 12 polling locations). In a vote center model, it may be necessary to have at least one mechanic at each site or perhaps assign mechanics to cover multiple sites.
    - Voter Registration may be able to assign people to each vote center to answer eligibility requirements, but probably would need to have people at the central location downtown to provide certificate of errors or approve changes in the ePollbook during the voting day.

Election Day Voter Processing

- Poll worker & voter interaction similar under both models
  - Voter enters polling location
    - Vote Center model – can go to any polling site in the county
    - Precinct-based model – must go to home precinct
  - Voter presents valid, government-issued photo ID
  - Poll worker finds voter in poll book
  - Voter signs their name
  - Poll worker determines the appropriate ballot style for voter
  - Voter votes
    - If DRE used, vote stored electronically
    - If paper, ballot scanned and stored in equipment

What happens after the polls close?

- Precinct-based Model
  - Poll workers shut down voting equipment and results tape printed
    - Current system marries the results from the DRE (iVotronic) to the optical scan system (M100), which are printed and signed by the poll workers
    - Poll workers remove electronic media from voting equipment
    - Poll workers organize used, unused and spoiled ballots into separate stacks, which are then sealed in envelopes
    - Poll workers finalize paperwork, including the ballot accounting certificate
    - Poll workers return materials to assigned Election Board Regional Site on election night
  - Election results from the electronic media uploaded from the regional site to a central server and are displayed online

- Vote Center Model
  - Follow similar procedures as precinct model, but process would be outlined in the Vote Center Plan
    - New voting technology will impact procedures
      - Can the equipment print precinct results at the vote center like current system?
      - If using printed ballots, would poll workers need to sort the ballots into 600 stacks – 1 for each precinct – before returning materials?
      - What would the ballot accounting certificate look like?
        - Not a state form; internal document used on Election Day

Election Results Certification Process

- Election Board has 10 days after an election to finalize results:
  - Process military & overseas absentee ballots and others that fall under court order
    - Military/overseas ballots can be received until noon, ten days after an election if postmarked on or before the date of the election
    - Marion County pursues a court order to process and count valid absentee ballots received by 6PM on Election Day and did not arrive at the precinct through no fault of the voter

- Review provisional ballots & hold public meeting for Board to decide whether or not ballots can be counted
  - Voters who did not present ID to vote and voted provisionally have until noon, ten days after an election to bring proper ID to Election Board
  - Volume varies on the election – from several hundred to more than a thousand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Received</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Counted</td>
<td>177 (16%)</td>
<td>35 (14%)</td>
<td>30 (16%)</td>
<td>123 (13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Election Results Certification Process

- Canvass election results
  - Marion County’s current process:
    - Bi-partisan teams review precinct’s combined totals tape printed from the M100 to the precinct’s results printed from the central server
    - Ensures the electronic transfer of data from the precinct’s voting machine to the central server was accurate
    - If any additional absentee or provisional ballots are counted, those results are also canvassed
    - May need to tweak process if vote center model implemented
  - Individual precinct results would be spread over all vote centers rather than contained to one polling location under current system
- Certify results to the Indiana Election Division

Absentee Ballot Processing

- Precinct Count
  - Absentee ballots are delivered to precinct on Election Day
  - Only can be utilized in a precinct-based election
  - State law prohibits a precinct count of absentee ballots under a vote center model
- Central Count
  - Absentee ballots are counted at a central site
  - Can be utilized in a precinct-based election OR vote center
  - Proposed legislation (SB621) would require three counties – Lake, Marion & Allen – to only count absentee ballots at a central site
  - No flexibility for local government in these three jurisdictions

Two Methods to Count Absentees

- Precinct Count
  - Absentee ballots are delivered to precinct on Election Day
  - Only can be utilized in a precinct-based election
    - State law prohibits a precinct count of absentee ballots under a vote center model
- Central Count
  - Absentee ballots are counted at a central site
  - Can be utilized in a precinct-based election OR vote center
    - Proposed legislation (SB621) would require three counties – Lake, Marion & Allen – to only count absentee ballots at a central site

Process for Precinct Count of Absentees

- On Election Day:
  - Bi-partisan teams are dispatched as early as 5:30AM in pre-defined routes to arrive at first site around 6AM
    - Travel by cabs that are required to have GPS tracking and open communication with the Election Board
    - This allows Election Board to locate where ballots are in the delivery process
    - Team arrives with a list of absentee voters and ballots specific to the precinct
    - Poll workers sign a receipt, which is returned by the bi-partisan teams to Election Board
    - Bi-partisan commissioners leave and go to next site on route
    - Poll workers then process absentee voters into the poll book and count valid ballots on the precinct’s voting equipment

Process for Precinct Count of Absentees

- Before Election Day:
  - Ballots are sorted and organized by precinct
  - Absentee applications and ballots are evaluated by bi-partisan signature review teams pursuant to a consent decree
  - Two major political parties asked to appoint commissioners to deliver ballots
    - Total number determined by absentee volume
      - Example: Each party was asked to appoint 50 people to create 50 bi-partisan teams in the 2012 Presidential Election
  - Process for Precinct Count of Absentees
    - On Election Day:
      - Election Board staff continue to receive absentee ballots and will send them out to be delivered to a precinct up to 6PM on Election Day
      - Absentee ballot results are included in the overall precinct results and cannot be parsed out

- Process for Precinct Count of Absentees
  - On Election Day:
    - Election Board staff continue to receive absentee ballots and will send them out to be delivered to a precinct up to 6PM on Election Day
    - Absentee ballot results are included in the overall precinct results and cannot be parsed out
Process for a Central Count of Absentees (Using Current Technology)

- **Before Election Day:**
  - Ballots are sorted and organized by precinct
    - Necessary step to reconcile with reports generated by statewide voter registration system including those used in the signature review process and at the precinct and central sites
  - Absentee ballots and applications are evaluated by bi-partisan signature review teams pursuant to consent decree
  - Two major political parties must appoint two sets of additional workers – couriers & commissioners
    - Couriers deliver lists to precincts
    - Commissioners count the ballots

- **On Election Day:**
  - Bi-partisan courier teams are dispatched to deliver lists of absentee voters to each precinct
  - Poll workers process list into the printed poll book to ensure absentee voters aren’t able to vote at the precinct
    - Poll workers circle ‘ABS’ in the poll book & print voter’s name in the signature block
  - Bi-partisan couriers return with processed lists to the central site and pick-up new lists to depart to precincts with updates
  - Bi-partisan absentee commissioners can begin processing absentee ballots when the first list arrives

Process for Central Count of Absentees

- Using current technology, process is substantially similar to what precinct poll workers already do:
  - Teams would check-out one precinct’s absentee ballots, M100 card & other materials from staff
    - M100 flash card electronically stores tabulated results
  - Ballots would be reviewed by bi-partisan teams to ensure signatures match the application and security envelope
    - Also need to check against the list received by the precinct to ensure all absentee voters processed properly
  - Precinct’s flash card inserted into M100 and a zero tape printed and signed by both team members

- On Election Day:
  - Results from the absentee ballots would not be included in the results returned by poll workers when the polls close
  - Potential refinements:
    - ePollbook solution could reduce the number of bi-partisan courier teams as updates made in real-time to all polling locations
      - Assuming all ePollbooks are connected to same server and not just to those machines in the polling location
      - If no countywide connectivity, small number of teams would need to deliver lists for absentee ballots received on Election Day
    - All electronic voting could simplify the ballot counting process, but difficult to address concerns about verifiable paper audit trail

- Expediency largely a function of how many people are available to process ballots and not necessarily due to speed of equipment
  - Example: 2003 Municipal Election Central Count of Absentees
    - Same M100 technology used then as is available today
      - Took more than 2 days to count 8,801 absentee ballots
    - Comparison:
      - 2008 General Election: 93,316 absentee ballots (high mark)
      - 2010 General Election: 22,163
      - 2011 Municipal Election: 19,090
      - 2012 General Election: 59,036
Administrative Perspective

**Poll Workers & Voting Equipment**

**Expanded Early Voting**

**More People Voting Before Election Day**

**Current Technology Limitations to Centrally Count Absentees**

---

**Poll Workers**

- Voting machines hold us back
  - Most complicated set-up in the country
  - Difficult for many poll workers to maneuver and lift—especially those that are older or have a disability
  - Due to the complexity, equipment set-up dominates training
  - Many poll workers ask for help Election Day morning
    - Some poll workers intimidated by equipment or set-up the machines in the wrong order
- New voting equipment needs to be able to work for poll workers with varying degrees of exposure to technology

---

**Expanded Early Voting Opportunities**

- Helps officials ensure a positive experience for disabled and older voters
  - Absentee options like voting by mail or traveling board helpful to those confined to their home
  - Early voting at the Clerk's Office & additional satellite locations makes voting more accessible, especially for voters with disabilities and older voters
- Takes enormous pressure off of Election Day poll workers

---

**More People Voting Absentee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Votes Cast</th>
<th>Absentee Votes</th>
<th>Net Election Day Votes</th>
<th>Absentee % of Total Votes Cast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/2004</td>
<td>323,673</td>
<td>27,430</td>
<td>296,243</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2008</td>
<td>381,759</td>
<td>93,316</td>
<td>288,443</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2012</td>
<td>361,416</td>
<td>59,036</td>
<td>302,380</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Current Technology Limitations in a Central Count**

- Optical Scan Ballot Reader (M100) is designed to tabulate one precinct's results
  - Elder compatible technology designed to read and tabulate multiple ballot styles (ES&S M650) may be available, but will be difficult to rent or buy first generation equipment
    - In 2002 M650s were $55,000 each
    - Marion County would need 3-5 machines to handle volume
- Limited number of M100s to use at a central site
  - 737 M100s in current fleet
    - 600 machines are deployed to precinct polling locations
    - 50 kept in reserve by mechanics
    - 87 available for a central count, assuming 100% fleet health

---

**Conversation**

Information on the next few slides was compiled at the April 29, 2013 meeting.

Facilitator: Carolyn Brown
## Poll Workers: Precinct Model

### Positives
- Good check & balance
- Familiar
- Neighborhood based, know voters
- Cost effective
- Ease of administration

### Improvements
- Extend the hours
- ePollbook
- Better use technology
- Improve efficiency during peak times

## Poll Workers: Vote Center Model

### Positives
- Pre-set, pre-determined
- Less confusion for voters on where to go, so less need for poll workers to be distracted
- Need for fewer poll workers, could be more proficient
- Knowing how many poll workers helps efficiency

### Improvements
- Large amount of resources; reduce redundancy in administration
- Increase early voting opportunities to take less stress off poll workers & pursue legislation to make additional early voting sites mandatory
- Current technology doesn’t support poll workers under this model

## Counting Absentees: At Precinct

### Benefits
- Absentee ballots are incorporated into precinct totals, so helps maintain anonymity
- Timeliness of results

### Negatives
- Room for human error in travel
- Logistics & expense

## Counting Absentees: At Central Site

### Benefits
- Ease of storing & counting ballots in 1 location
- Fewer hands on the ballots for mistakes, losses

### Negatives
- Total confusion at the central site
- How long it takes
- Delay results
- Bogus challenges
- Amount of resources
- Relying on lots of people to show up & be present

## Thank You!
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Follow-Up from Last Meeting

POLLS WORKER FEEDBACK
ABSENTEE BALLOT PROCESSING FEEDBACK
TOPICS NEEDING FURTHER DISCUSSION

Poll Worker Feedback

• Precinct-based model
  □ Positives
    ▷ Familiar
    ▷ Neighborhood-based
    ▷ Cost effective
    ▷ Good checks & balances
  □ Improvements/Negatives
    ▷ Extended voting time
    ▷ Better technology
    ▷ ePollbooks

Absentee Ballot Processing Feedback

• Precinct Count
  □ Positives
    ▷ Vote totals available quickly; timely counting
  □ Negatives
    ▷ Concerns about ballot security; too time consuming; costs more

• Central Count
  □ Positives
    ▷ Faster process; ease of sorting and securing ballots at 1 site
  □ Negatives
    ▷ Delay in results; costs more; current technology not designed for this system
Topics Needing Further Discussion

- Costs
  - Information to be covered in module 6
- Security & Types of Voting Technology
  - Information to be covered in module 4/5
- Conversation with other jurisdictions
  - Working toward a roundtable as part of module 6
- Companies/vendors currently under consideration
  - Final report from study group will help the Board shape its RFP process for new equipment
  - Any vendor can participate, but none are under consideration at this time

Topics Needing Further Discussion

- Why would we need 600 precincts in a vote center model?
  - Do we need 600? Maybe not BUT Indiana law requires counties to be carved into precincts of about 1200 registered voters
  - Election Board doesn’t decide precincts – county executive does
    - Tells us what legislative districts you live in, what candidates appear on your ballot, and whether or not you meet voter registration requirements
  - All vote centers do is take away the need for an assigned precinct polling location on Election Day
  - Voter can’t vote in every legislative district in the county; must have a ballot specific to their precinct

Legal Location Requirements

- Precinct-Based Elections
  - County executive selects the sites
    - Indianapolis Mayor serves this role due to UniGov
    - List of sites must be certified to the Election Board no later than 29 days before each election
  - Polling locations must be located inside the precinct UNLESS a suitable, accessible location cannot be found THEN
    - A polling site can be located up to 5 miles from the closest boundary of the precinct for which the site serves as a polling location OR
    - A polling site can be located in the same township as the same precinct that does not have an accessible facility (IC 3-11-8-3)
  - Precincts can be co-located in the same polling location
  - Some polling locations are compensated for the use of their facility
    - Public buildings are NOT compensated
    - All others receive $40 for each election
  - Polling locations are subject to change in each election

Marion County had 301 polling locations in 2012 General Election

Guest Speaker: Amy Waggoner, Deputy Chief of Staff to Mayor Ballard
Legal Location Requirements

- Additional outreach for polling location notice:
  - View polling location & find driving directions at indy.gov/VIP
  - Phone-based polling place locator available a few weeks before Election Day at (317) 327-VOTE
  - Post signs on locations not used from the previous election, directing voters to their new polling place

Mayor's Office Perspective
Guest Speaker: Amy Waggoner, Deputy Chief of Staff to Mayor Ballard

Overview
- 597 voting precincts
- Number of Individual Locations by Year (General Elections)
  - 2010 – 332
  - 2011 – 330
  - 2012 – 301
- 2011 Re-Precincting

Current Process
- Contact Schools & Fire Departments
- Contact Remaining Facilities
- Identify Needed Changes
  - Anywhere from 0-10 locations may be unavailable each election
- Review Complaints from Prior Election
- Initial Assignment
- Contracts Mailed Out
- Contracts Returned
- Re-assess Available Locations
- Follow-Up on Contracts Still Not Returned
- Finalize List
- Review List with Mayor
- Submit to the State

Challenges
- Unavailable Locations
- Unwillingness To Host
  - Private Buildings
  - Schools
- Complaints
  - Open Late
  - Inconvenient Set Up
  - Not Well Marked
  - Crowding
  - Damage to Buildings – Lack of Respect for Property
- Accessibility Issues
  - Often lacking marked parking near entrance

Opportunities
- Off Year Advancements
- Changing Contract Structure
- Require More Information
  - Floor Plans
  - Designate Ingress & Egress Points
  - Accessibility Parking Location
  - Large Turnout Line Locations
  - Designate Back-Up Contact for EDay Operations
- Better Information for Inspectors

“Super” Precincts
- Multiple precincts are combined at one polling location for Election Day voting, but only 5 poll workers staff the entire site (IC 3-11-8-4.3)
  - NOT the same as co-locating multiple precincts at one polling location where each precinct has up to 5 poll workers
  - Requires unanimous vote of Election Board
  - Requires staff to process voters in the proper poll book AND keep voted and unvoted ballots
  - Only logistically possible if ePollbooks permitted
Legal Location Requirements

- **Vote Center**
  - Required to have a minimum of 1 vote center for every 10,000 registered ACTIVE voters
  - Using 2012 general election registration numbers, Marion County would have 64 vote centers
  - 640,575 total registered voters; 637,820 active voters

- **Vote Center**
  - Locations are selected by the Election Board in its vote center plan, which requires a unanimous vote to approve
  - State law does NOT set minimum or maximum geographic requirements for the location of each vote center
  - Contrast with precinct-based elections where site selection is strictly outlined
  - Notice requirements the same as precinct-based elections
  - Remember, locations can change but only if Board unanimously agrees to amend its Vote Center Plan

Other Site Selection Factors

- **Parking challenges**
  - Vote centers and precinct polling locations need to have enough parking spaces for a large influx of voters
  - Need accessible parking spaces for voters AND poll workers
  - Often those spaces aren’t near the entrance of the polls or have a curb, which makes it difficult for wheelchair or scooter users
  - Polling locations are under contract to meet specific requirements that may not comply with their policies
  - Example: Many private businesses and churches don’t want campaign materials passed out, but contract requires them to do so

- **Schools**
  - Often used as polling locations and many are opting out of concerns for student safety
  - Depending on new voting technology or system, sites may need to have access to internet
  - Currently sites need to be able to provide electricity
  - Churches are not required by law to comply with the ADA

Discussion (completed during meeting)

**What do you think about super precincts?**

- Could be an efficient choice
  - Current technology may limit efficiency
- Might work for special circumstances
  - Turnout for ‘normal’ elections at precinct may preclude their use
- Would require ‘super’ poll workers
- Q: Are you limited to 2? No restriction in state law
  - Reservation in implemented would be anticipated volume of total voters at a site

**What do you like about voting at an assigned precinct?**

- Familiarity of location
- Ability to walk to polling site
- Knowing your poll workers
- Get to see everyone in the neighborhood – social experience
- Political divisions respond to geography; precinct helps to solidly define who represents them
- Accountability of results
If the county ever moves to vote centers, what requirements should the Board consider when making a site selection? Geographical? Accessible? On bus line?

- All of the above – geographical, accessible, on bus line
- Plentiful parking
- Site needs to be available to Election Board for an extended period of time
- Need internet access
- Need large square footage (example of a fire station – pulling truck out to be able to vote works for precinct, may not for vote center)
- Need improved access to early voting opportunities
- Should they be walkable? Can they be walkable? Will limit the number of sites that can be used if so
- Favorable traffic patterns

What out-of-the-box polling locations should be considered?

- Fireworks stands
- Mall
- Libraries
- Virtual site?
- Mobile (RV) site
- Hospitals
- Bus terminal/airport
- Funeral homes

What obstacles/problems might arise from selecting these creative locations?

- Parking may be difficult at a hospital especially navigating around emergency vehicles
- Cost to park
- Liability issues between city and private entities
- Location could bias the outcome of election/participation

HAVA & the ADA

- Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA)
  - Title II protects people with disabilities from being excluded from participating or receiving benefits of the services, programs or activities of a public entity OR being subject to discrimination of such entity
  - Only a "qualified individual with a disability" protected by Title II
  - Defined as "an individual with a disability who, with or without reasonable modification to rules, policies or practices, the removal of architectural, communication or transportation barriers, or the provision of auxiliary aids and services, meets the essential eligibility requirements for the receipt of services or the participation in programs or activities provided by a public entity"

- Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA)
  - Created new minimum standards for states to follow
  - Implemented new programs & procedures like:
    - Provisional voting
    - Updated & upgraded voting equipment
    - Statewide voter registration databases
    - Administrative complaint procedures

- HAVA complements the ADA
  - Ensures all voting systems are accessible for people with disabilities, including non-visual accessibility for the blind and visually impaired, in a manner that provides the same opportunity for access and participation as for other voters
HAVA & the ADA

Local Advisory Council for Polling Place Accessibility
- Part of Indiana’s HAVA plan includes the formation of local advisory councils composed in part of voters with disabilities and elderly voters to advise local officials on polling place accessibility and site selection
- Plan requires county executive to appoint members
  - Indiana’s full HAVA plan: http://www.in.gov/gpcpd/files/CountyAccessGuidetoVoting.doc

- Approximately 46% of surveyed voting locations present potential challenges for voters using wheelchairs, despite the implementation of accessible voting systems
  - Majority of these impediments occurred outside or at the entrance of the polling location, particularly in the path from the parking area to the polling location entrance

Setting Priorities

- Getting voters in the door
- Providing access to the areas where you provide voting accessibility
- Providing access to the restroom facilities that are provided for public use
- Eliminate any physical barriers

Getting Voters in the Door

Accessible Route
- Path a person takes, starting from the sidewalk or parking lot and going where a polling site provides access to voting
  - Parking lot must have identified spaces for voters AND poll workers with disabilities
  - Spaces should also be compliant for van accessible needs
  - Site must have an accessible entrance:
    - Should be in closest proximity as possible to accessible parking
    - Provide compliant ramps or elevators when necessary for access

Inside the Polling Location

- Rearrange tables, chairs, voting machines and other furniture to create adequate maneuvering space
  - See next slide
- Voting booths & equipment should be accessible to voters with disabilities
  - Currently, poll workers instructed to have at least one wheelchair accessible station for paper ballot users
  - Current electronic voting equipment (iVotronic) can be removed from its stand and placed on a table or tray

Example Site Layout
**Inside the Polling Location**

- Accessible equipment must be maintained and in good working order and be available to all voters
  - If equipment is temporarily out of service, a polling site should find alternative ways to service voters with disabilities
  - Call Election Day hotline immediately if equipment is out of service
- Different voters need different solutions
  - Service animals are allowed inside the polling location
  - Poll workers should be flexible, courteous
  - It’s OK to ask a voter how best to accommodate their needs

**Provide Access to Restrooms**

- If restroom facilities are provided for public use, they should be accessible:
  - Look for grab bars in toilet stalls
  - Evaluate sinks and paper towel dispensers for ease of access
  - Look for full length bathroom mirror
  - Extra space important for maneuverability

**Eliminate Physical Barriers**

- When accessible features are blocked or broken, your polling place is no longer accessible!
  - Make sure there are curb cuts at sidewalks and entrances to help voters with mobility issues
  - Rearrange tables, chairs and other furniture to create adequate maneuvering space
  - Elevators or lifts should be unlocked and in good working order

Don’t forget! Poll workers may also need special accommodations at the voting location; must balance their accessibility needs & the needs of voters.

**Discussion (completed during meeting)**

If you were building an accessibility checklist for polling locations, what would be on it?

- Good floor plan, flowing space regardless of number of ppl there
- Prepared poll workers
- Accessible equipment to vote
- Parking amenities/availability
- Minimize distance between parking & PPL entrance and then to the voting area
- Make sure restrooms are accessible
- Supportive & compliant host site (site managers, contact, etc)
- Impediments to accessing the voting sites may keep voters from participating on Election Day – “bias” the outcome
  - Technology may be able to provide greater access to system for all – not just people w disabilities, but also those with difficult work schedules, lack of transportation, etc.

**Best Practices**

- Sites should be larger and more visible
- More parking spaces, voting machines & poll workers reduce voting time
- More poll workers allow for specialization of certain tasks like checking in voters, assisting them with ballots, etc to improve the ‘service’ experience
  - Availability of experienced and knowledgeable poll workers to assist people with new or unfamiliar technologies enhances the voter’s experience and reduces voter errors

"When, where and how we vote: does it matter? “Robert Stein, Greg Vonnahme; Social Science Quarterly – September 2012
### Other Jurisdictions

- **Larimer County, Colorado (Fort Collins)**
  - Pioneered the vote center concept, first used in 2003 elections
  - **Legal Requirements:**
    - Vote Centers have secure electronic connection to ePollbook
    - Requires Vote Centers to comply with federal law
    - Sets population requirement of one Vote Center for every 10,000 active registered voters
    - Requires consultation with major and minor political parties during site selection

- **Austin, Texas**
  - 207 vote centers (total 247 precincts) in 2012 presidential election
    - Used all former precinct polling places, added a few extra sites and turned them all into vote centers
    - Determined this would limit voter confusion as voters adapt to the new ‘vote anywhere’ model
    - Will review data over time to consolidate or move vote centers

- **Lubbock County, Texas**
  - When first implemented in 2011, went from 69 polling places to 33 vote centers
  - Decided to increase to 50 vote centers in 2012 presidential election to meet demand and prevent long lines

### Administrative Perspective

- **Vote Center model**
  - Historic precinct data not reliable in predicting where voters will vote on Election Day, since they have more choices
    - Marion County is a consolidated city; most vote center counties have several city centers making it easier to spread out and predict turnout
  - To meet minimum requirements, each site needs to accommodate up to 10,000 voters
  - Difficult to determine equipment/poll worker needs per site because turnout is unknown
  - Voters may be less familiar with poll workers or facility

### Practical Considerations

- **Precinct-based model**
  - Largely uniform number of voters per precinct (about 1,200)
  - Turnout can be reasonably predicted at each polling location using historic data
  - While more sites needed, may be easier to find accessible locations because you need to meet smaller demand
  - Poll workers are familiar with voters
  - Voters likely know the polling place; have experienced being there
  - May be more accessible for voters lacking transportation or using mobility devices like scooters or electronic wheelchairs

- **Vote Center model**
  - Site selection best practices (from their website):
    - Voting locations in such geographic region needs to meet its voting population
    - Square footage must accommodate voting equipment and anticipated voter turnout
    - Adequate parking is a must, preferably on-site with good lighting and some parking spaces that are close to the building so they can be reserved for voters with disabilities
    - Locations on bus routes and major thoroughfares are preferable
    - Easily identifiable buildings
    - Site must be available for our use for multiple days
    - When possible, use the same locations year after year
    - While many schools would make great voting locations, most schools prefer not to be used because of their concern that opening the doors of schools to the general public may create a security concern for the children there
    - Preference is given to donated space, but other low-cost options are sought if a donated space is not available or cannot meet the necessary location criteria.
Sizing Up the Sites

# voters = fn(time(space + personnel + technology)]

• Size of polling location puts a constraint on the number of voters it can reasonably process in 12-hours
  o Precinct-based voting easier to predict – about 1,200 voters assigned to 1 precinct and established history helps identify low and high turnout locations
  o Vote Centers need to accommodate up to 10,000 voters but difficult to determine what sites will be busy or not – turnout will not be equally distributed across the county

• Early Voting in Clerk’s Office most closely replicates a vote center experience
  o Don’t need a reason to visit the office to vote before Election Day
  o Any voter can vote at the Clerk’s Office or satellite location

• 2012 Presidential Election
  o Total registered voters: 640,675
  o Total ballots cast: 361,416
  o Total absentee ballots: 59,202
    ✓ Mail: 17,912
    ✓ Traveling Board: 1,439
    ✓ Military: 1,061
    ✓ Early: 39,189
  o Net ballots cast at polling locations: 302,214

• Early Voting in Clerk’s Office/Rm 118 in November ’12
  o Processed 4,227 voters in 12 hours (8A to 8P)
  o Site accommodations:
    ✓ Paid street parking; two side lots reimbursing parking fees for early voters
    ✓ Building largely accessible
    ✓ Sheriff Deputies assisting with crowd control
  o Election Board Staffing
    ✓ 10 staff processing voters into statewide voter registration system
    ✓ 5 staff pulling pre-printed ballots
    ✓ 6 teams (12 ppl) of bi-partisan judges initialing ballots/greeting voters
    ✓ 6 teams (12 ppl) of bi-partisan judges receiving ballots
    ✓ 12 people from Clerk’s Office management team and other Election Board personnel to fill-in gaps

• Site accommodations, cont’d:
  ✓ Technology
    ✓ 25 laptops with Dymo label printers
    ✓ Assistance from ISA to set-up and trouble shoot
    ✓ Used pre-printed ballots as previous experience noted a bottle-neck at the ballot on demand printers (usually 2-3 per site)
    ✓ iVotronics
  ✓ 50 voting booths including ADA-compliant booths
  ✓ 6 gray ballot box to store paper ballots sealed in security envelopes
  ✓ 3 in use; 3 as back-up

On Sunday, November 4, it took most voters about 1.5 hours to go through the entire process – waiting in line, processing & voting.
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Follow-Up from Last Meeting

What stood out in best practices?

- Accessibility
  - Sites need to be accommodating to all voters
  - Number of accessible parking locations required at site
- Mail-in absentee ballot law in Colorado
  - Standing requests; high by-mail voting participation
- Enhancing contractual agreements and visiting polling locations before election

Consensus on Polling Locations/Accessibility

- Polling Site Best Practices:
  - Select polling sites that are familiar to the voters, preferably centrally located within the precinct
  - Develop a polling site facility checklist to ensure needs are met
    - Polling site floor plan is also important
  - Clearly mark the entrance to and exterior of polling site
  - Easy parking (plenty of spaces, easy entry & exit, close proximity to polling entrance)
  - Adequate signage & clear path to proper building entrance

Consensus on Polling Locations/Accessibility

- Polling sites & Accessibility:
  - Needs to be welcoming to everyone with no bias in location, process or signage
  - Ensure ADA compliance is a standard requirement
  - Complete a physical review before contracts are approved to ensure voting flow is adequate
  - Space for those individuals with physical disabilities to access machines easily is critical
  - Plenty of parking for individuals with disabilities close to accessible entrance & clear path from parking lot to entrance
- Early voting & extended voting hours are methods of increasing accessibility and convenience for all voters
**Additional Questions/Feedback**

- Who picks polling locations?
  - Precinct-based elections: County Executive (mayor) selects
  - Vote Center elections: Election Board selects but must agree unanimously on locations

- Is there a current checklist for polling locations?
  - The mayor’s office does not have a specific checklist though some items are included on the contract or discussed with the site
  - Sample polling place contract provided at last meeting

**Additional Questions/Feedback**

- Must an employer give time-off to employees to vote?
  - In Indiana, no – though there may be provisions in some bargaining agreements extending this benefit to employees.

**Cost & Jurisdictional Comparisons**

- Module 6 (June 24)
  - Cost discussion
  - Invited Clerk Christa Coffey (Tippecanoe) & Clerk Linda Moeller (Floyd) & extending invitations to other comparably-sized cities like Austin, TX (Travis County)

---

**Voter Experience Group Members:**

- Reminder:
  - Your feedback is critical to this process
  - If you have additional questions or feedback that you weren’t able to share during our scheduled meetings, please email our office
  - Comments and feedback will be used to draft the VEP Study Group report to the Election Board

**Deadline to submit additional comments is Friday, June 28**

Email: myla.eldridge@indy.gov

---

**Background**

- Help America Vote Act (2002) changed the way we conduct elections
  - Created new minimum standards for states to follow
  - Implemented new programs & procedures like:
    - Provisional voting
    - Statewide voter registration databases
    - Administrative complaint procedures
    - Updated & upgraded voting equipment

---

**Current Voting Technology**

**BACKGROUND**

**IVOTRONIC**

**HEALTH OF CURRENT SYSTEM**

**Lever Machine Facts:**

- Invented in the US in 1875
- Replaced paper ballots with multiple levers to be more reliable & tamper resistant than paper ballots, both important to early 20th century election administrators
- By 2000, more than 60% of US used lever machines
- Because of the cost of the lever machine about $5,000 compared to $300 for punch card Jurisdiction needed record paper punching products systems which cost about $1,000 per card

**Before 2002, most jurisdictions used lever machines or punch card voting systems**
**Background**

- HAVA sets forth requirements that all voting systems:
  - permit the voter to verify (in a private and independent manner) the votes selected by the voter on the ballot before the ballot is cast and counted;
  - provide the voter with the opportunity (in a private and independent manner) to change the ballot or correct any error before the ballot is cast and counted (including the opportunity to correct the error through the issuance of a replacement ballot if the voter was otherwise unable to change the ballot or correct any error); and
  - notify the voter of overvotes (votes for more than the maximum number of selections allowed in a contest) and provide the voter a chance to correct these errors.

- Other HAVA requirements:
  - Alternative-language accessibility be available pursuant to the requirements of section 203 of the Voting Rights Act
  - All voting systems must be auditable and produce a permanent paper record or ballot image with a manual audit capacity available as an official record for any recount conducted

**Current System**

- Marion County opted for a hybrid system in 2002
  - Purchased equipment from ES&S:
    - M100 optical scan ballot reader
    - iVotronic touch screen machine
  - Each precinct has 1 M100
  - Each polling location has at least 1 iVotronic
  - Satisfies HAVA requirements for independent voting experience

- Only jurisdiction in the country to marry the two technologies using the Personalized Electronic Ballot (PEB) reader
  - Important for being able to combine results of both machines and print out a zero tape to start the day and a results tape at the end of the day

**iVotronic (touch screen machine)**

- Provides independent voting experience
  - Satisfies the HAVA requirements
    - Audio-enabled ballot & Braille buttons aid voters with low or no vision
    - Touch pad can be removed from stand and placed on a wheelchair tray or lowered table
    - Large on-screen buttons require less precise hand movements
  - Provides confidential and independent access for voters with disabilities, though any voter can use it

- On average, about 1,000 people use the iVotronic to vote in Marion County each election
**iVotronic (touch screen machine)**

- **Features**
  - No ballot printing costs
  - Provides accessible voting experiences
  - Redundancy of data storage
  - Accurate (no stray marks, incomplete bubbles)
  - Clear instructions
  - Permits voters to double-check their ballot before submission
  - Can hold ballot styles for all 600 precincts
  - Won’t permit over-voting

- **Challenges**
  - Slow due to multiple screens per ballot; the audio ballot is especially lengthy
  - Limited access – only 1 voter at a time
  - Awkward set-up for poll workers
  - Character limits will shrink size of ballot text on the screen, affecting performance for voters with low vision
  - No paper trail

---

**M100 (Optical Scan Ballot Reader)**

- **Uses paper ballot cards and scanner reads and tabulates each ballot**
  - Reminders:
    - Ballots created using the precinct key developed by Voter Registration
    - Printing requirements outlined in state law:
      - One ballot be printed for every registered voter of the precinct in a general election
      - In a primary election, a formula is used to calculate the number of D & R ballots to make available in each precinct
    - On Election Day, ballot on demand printers located at a central location can print ballots in emergency situations

---

**Process**

- Voter ‘bubbles in’ their choices in ink on their ballot (no erasing)
- Voter feeds ballot through scanner & machine reads the ballot
  - If voter over-votes, the machine will beep and the voter can direct machine to accept their ballot or return it so that it can be spoiled by the poll workers & voter can mark a new ballot

- **Tabulating results**
  - Machine reads and tabulates voters’ choices
  - Results stored on an M100 card, which is secured in the machine and after breaking the seal, removed at the end of the day
  - Card delivered to regional site and results are transmitted electronically to a central server
  - Precinct results printed by machine once polls close

---

**M100 (Optical Scan Ballot Reader)**

- **Features**
  - Fast
  - Paper trail or independent hard copy of votes cast
  - Flexibility in site configuration

- **Challenges**
  - Stray and incorrect marks on ballots
  - Optical readers very sensitive and jostling during delivery can cause issues for poll workers
  - Example: need just 1 electrical outlet, voting booths don’t require electricity
  - More common voting method; poll workers & voters are accustomed to it
  - Ballot storage bin available in emergency situations
  - Can only read ballots & tabulate results for 1 precinct at a time

---

**Security Needs**

- State law outlines basic voting system requirements like:
  - Multiple memories, including but not limited to retention of ballot and/or electronic image of ballot
  - Built-in diagnostic software to detects & report system’s operability
  - Software written in modular fashion and cannot be self-modifying
  - Audit records
  - Zero tapes
  - Accuracy testing
  - Access controls and security features must be disclosed by vendor during the certification period
    - Certification process to be reviewed next meeting
  - State law requires system access procedures be determined by the county by election

---

**Health of Current System**

- **Overview**
  - Machines & software purchased in 2002; installed in 2003
  - iVotronics (touch screen machines) first used in 2006 Primary election
  - iVotronic and M100 developed before 2000 and no longer in production
  - Tabulation hardware out of date and near end life
  - Poll workers struggle with Marion County’s machine configuration
  - System still functional due to proactive maintenance, but the technology becomes incrementally more difficult to support each election
### Health of Current System

**iVotronic**
- 613 iVotronic machines
  - At least 1 deployed to every polling location; sites with more than 3 precincts receive 2
  - 70 machines set aside for mechanics to use as replacements on Election Day
  - 4-5 machines used during early voting & cannot be used on Election Day
- PEB readers
  - 504 working units
  - Pins on printer cables bend easily, making it difficult to maintain a connection with M100
  - iVotronic has to be opened first, so if unable to make connection M100 won’t work until mechanic arrives
- PEBs
  - Battery replacement needed on a regular basis

**M100 optical scanner**
- 737 scanners & compatible ballot storage bins
  - Each precinct gets 1 M100 system (about 600 deployed)
  - Another 50 are set aside for mechanics use as replacements on Election Day
- Replacement parts are mostly refurbished and are difficult to find
- PCMCIA cards are no longer in production & obsolete technology makes them more expensive to replace
- Batteries on flash cards need replaced
- Transportation expedites wear & tear

**Tabulation Network**
- Server built in 2003 running outdated software and hardware near end of life
- Individual workstations built in 2004 and hardware near end of life
- Laptops used at 4 Regional Sites to transmit election results
- Reliance on landline infrastructure antiquated
  - Sites need fax line capabilities and many locations are improving their communication networks and moving away from hard lines
  - Though not required in state or federal law, the county decided not to connect server and tabulation system to internet

**Tabulation Software**
- 'UNITY' developed by ES&S for first generation equipment
  - State certification only permits the software to run on Windows XP Service Pack 1 (operating system released around 2000)
  - Can’t put software on newer machines because today’s computers are too advanced to be compatible with software certifications
  - Hardware with tabulation software cannot be connected to the Internet or otherwise upgraded

**Contracts Expiring**
- Service maintenance agreement expires in December 2014
  - Current vendor services fleet of voting equipment, securing additional parts when necessary
- Tabulation software license expires in December 2014
  - Unclear if software will continue to be certified with the state or if vendor will continue to support it

**Bottom Line**
- Current technology still has useful life and ongoing maintenance ensures secure and safe elections BUT
  - Technology is outdated
  - Machine repair and failure rate increasing each election
  - Replacement parts are difficult to secure
  - Software and hardware licenses may not be supported in the near future
  - Tabulation network is outdated
Practical Considerations & Demonstration

Next section puts into context how our current voting technology (M100 & iVotronic) might work in a precinct or vote center election. Newer technology exists to alleviate many of these issues, but these slides illustrate the limitations of our current system.

Practical Considerations

**M100** (optical scan reader)
- Precinct-based system
  - 1 unit per precinct
  - 600 precincts x 1 machine = 600 machines (+ reserve)
- Machine’s small footprint permits use of smaller polling locations
- Poll workers only need to open one machine
- Limits effects of precinct key issue or other potential machine problems
- **Vote Center**
  - Using M100 exclusively, need 600 per site to read each precinct’s ballots
  - 64 sites x 600 machines per site = 38,400 machines (+ reserve)
  - Though equipment footprint small, still requires a lot of space to hold 600 machines, including areas to navigate around equipment
  - Burdensome for poll workers to open and support 600 machines
- Consider how many people would need to be available to lead voters to correct machine to vote!

Dimensions of the M100:
- **width**: 1’10”
- **length**: 2’

Additional room needed for maneuverability:
- 2’5” in front; 3’ on side

Total footprint: 21.35 sq ft per M100

If current M100 used in vote center model, would need 12,600 square feet for machines alone!

---

**iVotronic** (touch screen machine)
- Self-contained unit
- **Physical footprint small**
- Can store & tabulate data for all 600 precincts and related ballot styles
- Voting booths not needed if county exclusively used direct recording electronic (DRE) technology
- Slow – anticipate each machine handling 120 voters for entire 12-hour Election Day
- Takes voter about 5-6 minutes to complete a presidential election ballot (significantly longer if using audio ballot)
- Satisfies HAVA requirements for accessibility
- County doesn’t own compatible printer packs to print zero or results tapes (this is why the M100 and iVos are connected via PEB reader)
- No paper trail

---

Practical Considerations

**iVotronic**
- Precinct-based election
  - Currently, 1 assigned per polling location but will deploy 2 if 3 precincts or more are assigned
  - Using DRE exclusively:
    - (10,000 voters/120 voters per day) = 84 machines per precinct
    - 10 machines x 600 precincts = 6,000 machines (+ reserve)
- **Vote Center**
  - Using DRE exclusively:
    - (10,000 voters/120 voters per day) = 84 machines per site
    - 84 machines x 64 sites = 5,376 machines (+ reserve)
  - Though footprint small, 84 units & additional room to navigate would require significant square footage at site
  - Burdensome for poll workers to open 84 machines in less than an hour
  - Would need to have enough staff to support machines throughout the voting day as poll workers need to retrieve ballot using the PEB
Dimensions of the iVotronic:
- width: 2’8”
- length: 2’4”
Additional room needed for maneuverability:
- 3’ in front; 3’ on side
Total footprint: 30.7 sq ft per iVotronic

Some of the 613 iVotronics (touch screen machines) currently in storage at the Election Services Center.

Equipment Demonstration
- Open iVotronic first!
  - System will not work if iVo is not properly opened
- Assemble iVotronic & plug-in
- Insert PEB reader to wake machine & follow instructions
- Attach PEB reader to front of M100
- Plug in & turn on M100
- Follow instructions on machine & insert PEB into reader when prompted
- Unplug PEB reader when prompted
- Turn key to vote & lock down scanner to ballot bin

Looking Ahead to Next Meeting

Election Board Needs
- System needs to be robust enough to handle large turnout elections
  - New system should be better than current system; don’t take step backward in efficiency & flexibility
- Durable
- Simple to use for poll workers & voters
  - Would like plug & play to simplify the process & use poll worker training time better
- Paper trail
  - Difficult to perform recounts in a virtual environment only
- Accessible to all voters & allows them to vote independently
- Must be able to count tens of thousands absentee ballots at a central site
  - SB621 requires only Marion County to centrally count its absentees and our current technology is NOT designed to do so
- Voters must have confidence in the system

Poll Worker Needs
- Simplicity of set-up
- Reliability
- Lightweight, easily transportable
- Process at the end of the day takes a long time – is there a way to simplify, make it more efficient?
- Smart technology – possible for machine to help poll workers and lessen chances for error?

Polling Location Needs
- Accessible location – easy to get to, parking, getting into and out of the location
- Easily visible – known location
- Power outlets, access to internet, space (square footage) needs to accommodate new technology
### Voter Needs
- Convenience
- Time-off for employees (change in state law?)
- Privacy
- Confidence with technology, process
- Voting system easy to use, which may encourage people to vote consistently
- Early election nights – technology should share results more quickly after polls close

### Security Needs
- Encryption

### What did we miss?
- How will new technology help (or not) with provisional voters?
- Straight party voting issues with the software when system first implemented

### Next Meeting
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Recounts/Contests

▪ Indiana Code 3-12 outlines the recount and contest procedures depending on the type of election (local, school board, referendum and federal elections)
  ○ Legal action requiring a candidate or a party chair to file a petition within a specific time period after Election Day requesting a court order for a recount OR a contest

▪ Recount
  ○ Court order requires a physical review of ballots in specific precincts within the legislative district by a recount commission where members are appointed by the judge
  ▶ Election Board does NOT oversee this process; rather, staff pulls together materials requested by the order or commission
  ○ Generally relates to issues of human error
    ◾ Giving voter wrong ballot, missing clerk’s initials from ballot, etc.

▪ Contest action
  ○ Rare legal action challenging the legality and/or validity of the outcome of an election
  ○ Judge enters an order relating to the outcome of an election, including but not limited to requiring a new election

What reasons are needed for a recount/contest?

▪ State law requires the petitioner must, in good faith, believe that one or more of the following occurred:
  ○ The person declared nominated or elected does not comply with a specific constitutional or statutory requirement
  ○ A mistake was made in the printing or distribution of ballots used in the election that makes it impossible to determine which candidate received the highest number of votes cast in the election
  ○ A mistake occurred in the programming of an electronic voting system, making it impossible to determine the candidate who received the highest number of votes
  ○ An electronic voting system malfunctioned, making it impossible to determine the candidate who received the highest number of votes cast in the election.
  ○ A deliberate act or series of actions occurred making it impossible to determine the candidate who received the highest number of votes cast in the election.
How could a voting system impact a recount/contest?

- Parties involved in a recount need to have access to ballots cast
  - Ballot images available on a Direct Recording Electronic (DRE)
  - Paper ballots used in an optical scan system or a hand count
- Voting system failure or error – if material – could be reasons to contest an election outcome
  - Voting system needs to be secure and reliable to avoid issues that might result in a contest action

Top Requirements of New Voting System

- Accessible/HAVA compliant
- Secure & reliable
  - Confidence in system
  - Accuracy of results
- Simple for poll workers & voters to use
  - Easy to understand, set-up and break-down
- Flexibility to adapt to future business needs
- Able to process voters quickly & efficiently
- Reasonable cost

State-Level Election Administration

- **Secretary of State (SOS)**
  - Indiana's Chief Executive Officer
  - In charge of voter registration and list maintenance
  - Responsible for HAVA (Help America Vote Act) funds
  - Chairs the Indiana Recount Commission and certifies electronic pollbooks

- Indiana Election Commission (IEC)
  - 2 Co-Directors (1 Dem, 1 Rep)
  - State source for information on precincts and voter registration
  - Day-to-day support for local election administrators, election boards, public
  - Research campaign finance fines and election law violations, make final determination
  - The party of the SOS determines who chairs the IEC

- Indiana Election Division (IED)
  - All Indiana counties have an election board with bipartisan representation
  - Similar functions as the IEC on a local level rather than state or federal
  - State law and/or IEC approves procedures and forms for local bodies to use
  - IEC also approves voting systems, though the county selects which type it uses

VSTOP

- Established by P.L. 221-2005, SEC. 95.
- Duties outlined in IC 3-11-16
- Secretary of State enters into contract with entity to:
  - Make recommendations to the Indiana Election Commission (IEC) on the certification of voting systems.
  - Track changes to voting systems (Engineering Change Orders (ECOs) and advisories)
  - Create an inventory database of voting systems in the 92 counties.

State Certification of Voting Systems: The Role of VSTOP (Voting Systems Technical Oversight Program)

- Ball State responded to Request For Proposals (RFP) and won contract in 2009
- Originally funded by fees and penalties on vendors
- Currently part of Biennium budget (2013-14)
Part I: Certification

- **Purpose:** Conformity to Indiana Code
- **Method:** Protocol
  - Prepared by VSTOP in conjunction with Indiana Election Division (IED)
  - Vendor comments solicited and incorporated
  - Approved by IED

Certification

- **Application**
  - IEC 11 (state form)
- **Document Review**
  - Technical Data Package (TDP)
  - Voting System Testing Lab (VSTL) Reports
  - Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Certification (if applicable)
- **Functional on-site testing**
  - Follows careful Protocol script to confirm all components and conformity to Indiana Code
  - Mock election
  - Accessibility and disability testing
  - Videotaped and archived
- **Presentation of Findings to Indiana Election Commission (IEC)**
- **IEC Action**

Engineering Change Orders

- De Minimis
- Modification
  - Undergoes closer scrutiny
  - May involve additional testing

Electronic Voting Systems

“The total combination of mechanical, electromechanical, and electronic equipment (including the software, firmware, and documentation required to program, control, and support the equipment) that is used to define ballots, cast and count votes, report or display election results, connect the voting system to the voter registration system, and maintain and produce any audit trail information.”

Electronic Voting Systems

In addition, a voting system includes the practices and associated documentation used
- to identify system components and versions of such components;
- to test the system during its development and maintenance;
- to maintain records of system errors and defects;
- to determine specific system changes made after initial certification;
- to make available any materials to the voter (such as notices, instructions, forms, or paper ballots).

Functional Requirements of Voting Systems

... all types of voting systems must provide these capabilities:
- vote privately as voter intends
- opportunity to revise
- overvotes and undervotes
- accessible for individuals with disabilities
### Types of Voting Systems

(2005 VVSG Vol. 1)

- **Paper-Based Voting System**
  - Records votes, counts votes, and produces a tabulation of the vote count from votes cast on paper cards or sheets.

- **Direct-Recording Electronic Voting System**
  - Records votes by means of a ballot display provided with mechanical or electro-optical components that can be activated by the voter and records voting data and ballot images in memory components.

- **Public Network Direct-Recording Electronic Voting**
  - Uses electronic ballots and transmits vote data from the polling place to another location over a public network.
  - Vote data may be transmitted by individual ballots, periodically in batches or one batch at the end of voting day.

- **Precinct Count Voting System**
  - Tabulates ballots at the polling place typically as they are cast and results are printed after the close of Election Day.

- **Central Count Voting System**
  - Tabulates ballots from multiple precincts at a central location.

### Voting Systems Technologies

- **Direct Record Electronic (DRE)**
- **Optical Ballot Scanner (OpScan)**
- **Combinations**
- **Levels of Accessibility**

### OpScan (Optical Scanner)

![OpScan Image]

### DRE (Direct Record Electronic)

![DRE Image]

### Combinations

![Combinations Image]

### Technologies across United States

![United States Map]

Marion County, Ind. should be shaded pink as it’s a mixed system (touch screen & optical scan).
Overall System Capabilities of Voting Systems

- Security
- Accuracy
- Integrity
- System auditability
- Election management system
- Vote tabulation
- Ballot counters
- Telecommunications
- Data retention

Integrity

- Prevent failure
- Protect against the interruption of electrical power
- Protect against environmental hazards
- Protect against the failure of any data input or storage device
- Protect against any attempt at improper data entry or retrieval
- Record and report the date and time of normal and abnormal events

Voting Systems Certified in Indiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Vendor</th>
<th>Voting System(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES&amp;S</td>
<td>AutoMARK, AccuVOTE, Assure, Unity 3.6.1.0, Unity 3.2.1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart InterCivic</td>
<td>Electronic Voting System 6.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MicroVote</td>
<td>Infinity Model VP-1, EMS 4.0B (Modification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unisyn</td>
<td>OpenElect 1.0, 1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ePoll Books

- Replaces physical, printed poll books
- Maintains complete county voter rolls
- Allows instantaneous voter identification and verification of voting status
- Facilitates county and Voter Registration System (VRS) updates
- Makes vote centers possible

ePoll Book System Requirements

- Must be programmed so that the coordinated action of two (2) election officers who are not members of the same political party is necessary to access the electronic poll list.
- May not be connected to a voting system.
- May not permit access to voter information other than information provided on the certified list of voters prepared under IC 3-7-29-1.
- Information must be encrypted and placed on a dedicated, private server to secure connectivity between a precinct polling place or satellite absentee office and the county election board.
Future of Voting Systems?

- Los Angeles County’s Voting Systems Assessment Project (VSAP)
- Internet Voting
- Uniformed & Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA)
  - Federal law to assist military and civilian voters residing out of the country to access their right to register and vote
- PRIME III Voting System
  - Touch or voice recognition
- Certification Changes
  - Certificate of conformance

Discussion

Given what you have learned, should Marion County purchase new equipment?

YES – WHY?

- Equipment is outdated
- Given advances in technology, especially security, would be beneficial
- SB621 requires a change in voting system given current equipment parameters
- Limited availability of replacement parts for current system
- Democratic society can’t afford to vote, are we still a democratic society?

NO – WHY?

- Technology is moving forward, changing and what we purchase now may not be workable in the future
- Budget $$ may not be available; availability of funding difficult

NOT SURE – WHY?

- Advancements in newer equipment may not justify the expense
- Political parties should fund their own primaries, which may help fund new equipment or advancements in voting technology

Given what you have learned, should Marion County purchase new equipment?

What are your concerns about using a primarily paper ballot focused system?

- Printing ballots can be tedious & complicated
- Time consuming process to collate ballot information (before to create them, to distribute to precincts & pull together when polls close)
- Physical storage
- Impede process to other technologies, especially as it limits voters to one location to vote on Election Day
- Less accessible for voters with disabilities
What are your concerns about using a primarily electronic (paperless) focused system?

- Distrust of the technology may lead to less confidence in system by voters
- How would provisional ballots be segregated/implemented in a totally paperless system
- System fails – then what?
- Lack of a paper trail
  - System is hacked or somehow infiltrated then paperless system more difficult to validate election results
- Older voters may have limited exposure to technology and be unsure of using
- Electronic system may be more expensive to purchase, maintain
- Software and other back-end systems may be impacted, too
- Does a recount exist in an all electronic environment?

If a combination system is purchased, would you prefer use a paper ballot read by a scanner or an electronic ballot with a paper record ‘receipt’, or log?

- Big brother
- Random ‘save’ features of an electronic ballot to not be able to identify the voter’s selection
- Some voters may not be comfortable with touchscreen – familiarity of paper ballot
- Potential for a touchscreen system to print a paper ballot and hold internally without voter touching it
- Intelligent systems can produce a paper trail without a paper ballot
- How do you define a paper trail?
  - Some states perform post election audits submitted to state and reviewed as to official count on the machine on Election Day and later confirming the machine has same number many months after the election
- Not enough information to answer this question?

What should be the MCEB’s primary concerns when evaluating voting systems for purchase?

- Security
- Ease of use
- Accuracy
- Cost

Reminder:
- Your feedback is critical to this process
- If you have additional questions or feedback that you weren’t able to share during our scheduled meetings, please email our office
- Comments and feedback will be used to draft the VEP Study Group report to the Election Board

Voter Experience Group Members:
Deadline to submit additional comments is Friday, June 28
Email: myla.eldridge@indy.gov
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Follow-Up from Last Meeting  
COMBINATION SYSTEM

Combination Systems

- Combination systems improve upon direct recording electronic technology by making a hard paper trail possible

Combination Systems

- Systems vary depending on manufacturer
  - Some exclusively use touch-screen technology for every voter to mark a virtual ballot, which is then printed in hard form for their review and then tabulated by a scanner system
  - Others have a touch-screen component built into the voting system to meet accessibility needs but use a paper ballot that can be printed on demand or pre-printed
  - Still others use the touch-screen feature and ballots are tabulated electronically though in addition to the electronic image, a hard copy is printed and stored in the machine

Election Administrator Roundtable

- TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS  
  MR. MICHAEL WINN, DIRECTOR OF ELECTIONS  
- FLOYD COUNTY  
  HONORABLE LINDA MOELLER, CLERK  
- TIPPECANOE COUNTY  
  HONORABLE CHRISTA COFFEY, CLERK
County Background

- Population
  - Tippecanoe County, IN: 172,780
  - Floyd County, IN: 74,578
  - Marion County, IN: 918,977
  - Travis County, TX: 1,024,266

- Registered Voters
  - Tippecanoe County, IN: 595,269
  - Floyd County, IN: 55,966
  - Marion County, IN: 640,675
  - Travis County, TX: 595,269

- Precincts
  - Tippecanoe County, IN: 116
  - Floyd County, IN: 60
  - Marion County, IN: 600
  - Travis County, TX: 210

- Vote Center Transition Year
  - Tippecanoe County, IN: 2006/07
  - Floyd County, IN: 2013
  - Marion County, IN: n/a
  - Travis County, TX: 2012

- Number of Vote Centers:
  - Tippecanoe County, IN: 19
  - Floyd County, IN: n/a
  - Marion County, IN: n/a
  - Travis County, TX: 157

- Number of Staff at Each Vote Center:
  - Tippecanoe County, IN: 3-10 based on size of center
  - Floyd County, IN: 5
  - Marion County, IN: n/a (5 poll workers at each precinct)
  - Travis County, TX: 8

- Voting Equipment
  - Tippecanoe County, IN: Direct Recording Electronic
  - Floyd County, IN: Combination System
  - Marion County, IN: Direct Recording Electronic & Optical Scan
  - Travis County, TX: Direct Recording Electronic

  Travis County is also exploring building their own combination voting system

- Absentee Voters in 2012 Presidential Election
  - Tippecanoe County, IN: 21,238
  - Floyd County, IN: 5,187
  - Marion County, IN: 59,036
  - Travis County, TX: 237,419

Costs

- 2002 Equipment Purchase
  - Election Environment
    - Precincts: 917
    - Polling Locations: 315
  - Voting System Purchase
    - 937 Optical Scan Machines (ES&S M100)
    - 615 Touch Screen Machines (ES&S iVotronics)
  - Total Bond Issue
    - $11.1 million
Moving Forward

Voting Equipment
- Current System
  - Not sustainable for the long term
  - Not adaptable for future business needs
- Future System
  - Must Have:
    - Secure
    - Accurate
    - Work in a central count environment for absentee ballots
    - Easy to set-up and tear down for poll workers
    - Easy for voters to use
    - ADA compliant

Moving Forward

Voting Equipment, con’t
- Future System
  - Choices
    - Paper Trail
      - Paper Ballot?
      - Printed record of ballot/vote?
      - Electronic record that can be printed?
    - Adaptable to Future Business Needs
    - WHAT ELSE?

Moving Forward

Ballot Printing
- Choices:
  - Optical scan or combination system
    - Pre-print ballots
      - Cost is about $0.32 per ballot
      - Less flexible
    - Ballot on demand
      - Printed on-site
      - Greater flexibility
  - Direct Recording Electronic
    - No ballot printing
      - Many jurisdictions will print some paper ballots for back-up but still need for absentee ballot voting
    - No “hard copy” paper trail

Moving Forward

Poll Book
- Choices:
  - Print poll book for each precinct
    - Current cost to print a poll book per election: $45,000
    - Practical only in a precinct-based election
  - Purchase ePollbook (electronic poll book)
    - Option for all counties regardless of Election Day voting method
    - Required in a vote center model
    - Connect to central server or not?
      - Central server connectivity would require wireless service in polling sites or air cards and allow for real-time updating
      - Networked machines can communicate to each other in the same polling site, but no real-time updating to central server
      - Both options may help voter registration officials update their records after Election Day, however

Moving Forward

Poll Workers
- Precinct-Based Elections
  - Number Needed: 600 precincts x 5 poll workers = 3,000
  - Pay: $390 per precinct x 600 precincts = $234,000 per election
    - $110 earned by Inspector; other poll workers earn $70
  - County executive determines poll worker pay rate
- Vote Center Elections
  - Number Needed: Unknown
    - Does not eliminate the need for party-appointed poll workers
    - Type of voting system will drive the division of labor
  - Pay: Unknown
    - Would require more sophisticated staff to handle technology

Moving Forward

Support Staff
- Hotline Operators & Dispatch Center (mechanics & supply runners)
  - Choices:
    - Centralize operations
      - One central dispatch works best for precinct-based elections
    - Regionalize operations
      - May be more practical to station supply runners, hotline staff and mechanics at a vote center, though would likely increase staffing requirements due to volume
      - Less efficient
      - More difficult to ensure consistency in communications with problem solvers assigned to each site
Next Meeting

REPORT DISCUSSION & RATIFICATION
MONDAY, JULY 15 | 5:30 PM
PUBLIC ASSEMBLY ROOM
CITY-COUNTY BUILDING

Voter Experience
Group Members:
Deadline to submit additional comments is Friday, June 28
Email: myla.eldridge@indy.gov

• Final Report
  ○ Minority reports and/or additional comments must be submitted by Friday, June 28
  ○ Draft report circulated to group members week of July 1
  ○ Be prepared to discuss content of report and suggest changes at July 15 meeting
Presentation Feedback
Slide 15: Can we provide the total cost in 2002?
Slide 18: Wanted to better understand the governance structure of the Election Board
Slide 25: How many sets of eyes proofing ballots?
Slide 27: Clarify that primary election ballot order depends on the highest vote getter in each precinct for the last general election pursuant to state law
Slide 31: When are provisional ballots tallied?
Slide 33: Clarify in future presentations that inactive & active voters appear in the poll book
Slide 35: Who decides how we can vote on Election Day in Indiana?
Slide 39: Question about the 5 mile requirement. May want to further explain site requirements in our polling location presentation.
Slide 41: Do you need more equipment for a central count? May want to explain how our current technology does not fit the central count requirements; difficult to find equipment on the market now to work with our old machines
Slide 42: What are the public notice requirements for polling location changes in a precinct-based election?

Responses to Questionnaire
Question 1 – What are your constituent goals for this process?
   1. To make it easier and more convenient to vote
   2. Voter-centric ease of voting, Hard copy vote trail, Containing costs
   3. Increased voter accessibility & opportunity
   4. An opportunity for all eligible voters to safely and accurately cast their vote is the ultimate goal
   5. Fundamental fairness in the election process
   6. Focus on short and long term fiscal impact to the County, replacement cost cycle, annual operational costs
   7. To make an informed & fiscal responsible decision as to conduct & technology of future elections
   8. Access to voting process. Improved site access, including location, transportation needs, parking, equipment, etc. Also, use of absentee, other alternatives to vote including satellite centers, etc.
   9. I don’t know. But my goal is to promote a process in which as many legitimate voters who wish to vote are able to do so, To have relevant information available to inform their voting decision, Have their vote count (NOTE: I reworded this comment slightly to make it more readable.)
   10. To have a large & active educated voting population in Indianapolis
   11. Easy to understand/fair elections, How technology can assist in voting process, Use of technology to provide measured and certified results/defensible results
12. Come up with the best possible way for Marion County voters to cast their ballots.
   Weigh the +/- of the different technologies and forms of voting.
13. Best voting process; ballot security; fraud; accessibility; costs
15. To get the best, most cost effective, machines to meet needs of Marion County
16. For persons with disabilities my goal is to make the ease of voting so transparent and
   friendly that the use of absentee, early or whatever means encourage more people to
   vote & enjoy it! New technology is out there- let’s use it! The majority of people are
   embracing cellphones, iPads, laptops.

From meeting discussion (may duplicate above responses):
- Make it easier, more convenient
- Fundamental fairness in the process
- Hard copy vote trail
- Short or long-term fiscal impact to the county
- Informed and fiscally responsible decision in elections & voting technology to do so

Question 2 – What new information did you hear tonight?
1. Complexity of decision making process when weighing variables on location and
   machines
2. Anyone can request a provisional ballot & the requirement that 1 Vote Center is
   required for every 10,000 voters
3. Vote Centers not a good option for large county vs. smaller communities
4. Many of the detail and lines of authority that govern the election process
5. Distinction between Precinct & Vote Center methods of conducting elections
6. Complexity of Vote Centers for urban areas, Lack of clarity in statutes
7. Vote Center vs. Precinct – new to me.
8. Precinct vs. Vote Center descriptions, Election Board processes
9. I learned a great deal this evening & need to process this information to provide
   feedback on topics for further discussion/explanation & data needs. I will email more
   thoughts in the near future.
10. I received clarity on how precincts are moved and voters notified. I gained knowledge
    of differences (cost/technological) & necessities for both precinct and Vote Centers.
11. How many Vote Center per voters and this does not include inactive voters
12. Need more clarity in Vote Center requirements.

From meeting discussion (may duplicate responses):
- Cost & complexity of vote centers
- Lack of clarity in the statute for vote centers
- Three-member Board ultimate direct decision – their authority & oversight

Question 3 – What topics need further discussion and explanation?
1. Security of the ballot transportation and vote count process
2. Pros & cons of managing 65 Vote Centers
3. Cost of technology to offer more opportunities for voting fairness
4. Where can costs be reduced? How can accessibility be improved? How can security of process be optimized?
5. The cost of elections and the cost of equipment
6. Pros & cons of each voting machine type
7. What are the technological requirements & costs of Precinct or Vote Center models
8. Use of Satellite locations, Accommodations possible with new equipment, technology
9. The challenges of voters, The “consumer perspective”
10. Recount options that are available for Vote Centers? What issues arise? How many polling locations to we currently have?
11. What technologies are we lacking in Marion County? Why we are just now doing it?
12. More details on Vote Center counties. Discuss their positive & negative experiences. Discuss technology costs associated with Vote Centers. Discuss technology security associated with Vote Centers.
13. How much money does it cost?
14. Machine security

**Question 4 – What additional materials or data can we provide to you to make this process more helpful and meaningful?**

1. Research on voter satisfaction, voting success and cost savings from best practices across country with various voting machines & voting methods
2. Pros & cons of each voting system
3. Voting statutes not clear. Current and pending statutes. Uni-Gov gives too much power to the Chief Executive who has the ability to control his or her own destiny for re-election.
4. The evaluation thus far has been helpful
5. Cost analysis of Vote Centers vs. Precincts, Technology improvement during the last 10 years, How long were the old machines used?
6. More information about how electronic voting vs. paper scanning affects access to voting
7. Data on voters
8. I’d like to look at Austin, TX experience with Vote Centers since they have a larger population & similar voting population. In addition, how has this affected voting? Increased, decreased, or stayed the same?
9. All of tonight’s data was great; keep it coming.
10. All materials and data associated with my questions in #3. All materials and data associated with my questions in #3 as related to current Precinct method.
11. How Vote Centers work elsewhere, maybe have another county come in & discuss the pros and cons on Vote Centers.

**Audience Feedback**

1. Concerns about vote center model - conducting a recount; opening the door for
candidates or non-candidates to commit voter fraud; training poll workers who may lack the necessary skills to use new technology confidently; what’s the cost?
Module 2 Discussion Feedback
Voter Experience Project
Module 2 Presentation Feedback & Discussion Notes | April 29, 2013

Presentation Feedback

- Slide 8: Can we outline the costs for all contractual services?
- Slide 22: How many vote centers do we need? Do precincts go away?
- Slide 22: What are the geographical requirements of vote centers?
- Slide 22: How many hours are vote centers open; what about satellite sites – how many vote centers have to be open to early voting?
- Slide 22: Under the vote center structure, what roles would the precinct officials have?
- Slide 25: Are voting machines certified?
- Slide 32: Instead of 600 teams counting ballots, would there be fewer teams counting ballots for 600 precincts at a central count site?

Responses to Questionnaire

Poll Worker Section: Precinct Model Discussion

Positives concerning precinct-based poll worker structure follow:

1. Fairly well understood process, familiar with respect to staffing needs and manner by which election is conducted
2. More access & gives precinct committee person a better idea of how the voters of his/her precinct casted; cost effective and easier to administer
3. Familiarity; sense of neighborhood/community
4. Ability to walk to polling site
5. Process is familiar to the voter; locations, people involved are known to the voter
6. Neighbors working polls, familiar with voters
7. Workers know the voters
8. Tradition; proximity to one’s home
9. Ease of administration using current technology – that could change as we learn more about other options. Process is known & confidence exists among workers & voters
10. Consistency across precincts as far as process, staffing, etc., to make more predictable for voters
11. Checks & balances
12. Good checks & balances
13. Checks and balances are met; political parties have input on the workers

Negatives/areas for improvement concerning precinct-based poll worker structure follows:

1. Increased emphasis on the roles of poll workers & their responsibility if they encounter a perceived problem during voting process
2. More early voting centers geographically placed to allow every community access to early voting; extended hours
3. More continuity and experience among workers; more training about solving problems
4. Extend hours
5. Improve time to vote
6. All polls workers within a polling site live in the township where working
7. Have longer hours
8. Starting over from scratch to find better methods that may be cheaper and provide better opportunities to vote
9. Need to implement ePollbooks to improve accuracy & efficiency; expand early voting hours or timelines
10. Efficiency during peak times
11. Time learning machines vs. process, ePollbook
12. Waste of resources and redundance with our current technology; heavily reliant upon people and their availability; need better technology & efficiency
13. Better selection of workers

List of top positives about precinct-based poll worker structure follows.
1. Neighborhood based, cost effective, familiar
2. Easy to administer, familiar process, checks & balances in place
3. Centralized, pre-set, pre-determined & fewer polls workers & equipment(?), and less cost
4. Locations are already determined, less confusion
5. Neighborhood based, familiar
6. Ease of administration, known process/confidence/familiar, checks & balances
7. Familiar, ease of administration, check & balance
8. Good check & balance
9. Checks & balances, familiar/neighborhood based, ease of administration
10. Good checks & balances for selecting polls workers

List of top improvements concerning precinct-based poll worker structure follows.
1. Extend hours, better technology
2. Extend hours, ‘ePollbook’
3. Loss of neighborhood & familiarity (but expands worker base & based on geographical locations), precinct confusion/reduction, redundancy in administration
4. ePollbooks
5. Efficiency during peak times, extend hours, technology
6. Better use of technology, improve efficiency, ePollbook
7. Extend hours for workers, ePollbooks, better use of technology

**Poll Worker Section– Vote Center Model Discussion**

Positives concerning vote center poll worker structure follow.
1. Central planning?! Workers may have greater expertise than a 1 day, every year poll worker
2. Travel; availability; ease the ‘burden’ of getting to a polling placed
3. Possibly easier access to polls; more options for when/where to vote
4. Needs fewer bodies; workers become more proficient; convenience
5. Convenience for voters. **not sure I know enough yet to answer
6. Becky Motsinger – voters can go to any vote center
7. Less poll workers overall, centralized poll book, no/less confusion over polling sites
8. Pre-set plan; less confusion by arriving voter. Less need for bodies
9. Pre-set & pre – agreed on vote center plan

Negatives/areas for improvement concerning vote center poll worker structure follows.
1. Potential use of technology to even further simplify the functions of poll workers, but reduce the amount of technology necessary to implement vote centers
2. Constitutional or legislative requirement for greater access; increase early vote opportunities to alleviate further voter disenfranchisement
3. On-site problem solvers; technology with improved access
4. Requires new technology
5. Could be costly – both on personal & technology; could be time consuming
6. Establish baseline of number of vote centers
7. Hard copy of ballots, possibly less voting locations overall
8. Extend hours for workers, ePollbook, better use of technology
9. More procedural overview prior to plan being determined

List of top positives concerning vote center poll worker structure follows.
1. None
2. Fewer workers needed
3. Fewer poll workers, pre-set & determined, less confusion
4. Familiar, knowing how many poll workers, few poll workers
5. Need for fewer poll workers & pre-set locations
6. Known plan, convenience for voters, known need for workers
7. Fewer poll workers, pre-set, determined
8. Pre-set, less confusion
9. Pre-set, pre-determined; less confusion for voter, need for fewer poll workers
10. Vote plan is pre-determined

List of top improvements concerning vote center poll worker structure follows.
1. Train time needs to be decreased, technology needs to be increased, precinct not involved
2. Requires new technology
3. None
4. Increase early voting, less workers
5. Current technology does not support model
6. Reduce redundancy
7. Early voting, remove redundancy
8. Large amount of resources needed, increases early voting opportunities, current technology doesn’t support
Absentee Ballot Processing Section – Precinct-Based Model Discussion

Benefits of processing absentee ballots at the precinct?
1. Vote totals available more quickly
2. Timeliness and integrated totals
3. Voters know precinct workers, names are in the book, absentee vote counted in the precinct total; timely
4. More manageable, more quickly processed
5. Will already know the count
6. Voter anonymous, joined vote tally from the precinct
7. Known process, it’s understood; could be more efficient with ePollbooks
8. Ease in organizing ballots to correct precinct, more efficient
9. All ballots of precinct counted together
10. Counted & secure with members of ‘your precinct’ perception, timely results
11. Vote gets counted within your precinct

Negatives of processing absentee ballots at the precinct?
1. Ballot co-mingling & insecurity; more you move ballot more concerned about proper handling in a prompt manner
2. Transporting ballots and difficulties
3. Total confusion last time, bogus challenges
4. Distribution of ballots to precinct for county & back is wasteful; required move later to distribute and count
5. Suspicious of their neighbors knowing how they voted
6. Too many to count. Knowing how one votes
7. Logistics; expenses
8. Time consuming, costly
9. Time & expense of getting ballots to precinct, need to sort beforehand
10. Room for human error in travel; waste of $/resources in travel; logistics
11. Waste (in transportation for ballots, twice; once to deliver to precinct & once back); logistics, expense

Absentee Ballot Processing Section – Central Count

Benefits of processing absentee ballots at a central site?
1. Expertise; smaller population with greater familiarity processing all ballots
2. Less transporting of ballots
3. Efficiency of process
4. Eliminates counting at precinct & delaying workers from getting home, better logistics
5. Ease of storing & counting ballots in one location
6. Ease of processing ballots; less chance for lost ballots
7. Convenience, process faster
8. All ballots are delivered to one location instead of 600 preventing lost ballots
9. No travel, less cost for gas/cabs, etc.; ease of sorting; lower chances of error
10. Safety, less opportunity
11. One location for all ballots; ease of storage & counting votes

**Negatives** of processing absentee ballots at a central site?

1. Need a steady number of committed poll workers
2. Too much to do at one site; delay in obtaining vote totals
3. How are votes secured between receipt & counting?
4. None
5. Too many ballots to count
6. Probably no negatives
7. Time consuming, costly
8. Cannot split ballots easily among 600 precincts
9. Machines are outdated; it would take too much time or machines; need to be stored and run one precinct at a time – too much time
10. Amount of resources necessary; people needed
11. Resources required

**Consensus**

What are some areas of consensus to focus on moving forward?

1. Can we employ a simpler machine, easier to set up?
2. The need for more satellite/early voting; updated technology
3. Improved technology
4. Abandon discussion of Vote Centers
5. New equipment would improve either process; Vote Centers could work if guaranteed great access to polls
6. No response
7. Speakers from another county that has dealt with vote centers
8. Agreeing that improvement can provide for better elections
9. Need actual experience from jurisdictions that have vote centers and compare to precincts
10. Need for improved technology; need to improve efficiency; need to improve the amount of resources needed

**General Information**

What new information did you hear tonight?

1. Indiana General Assembly is attacking the voting process in the ‘Mega City’ of Indianapolis
2. Additional information on central site count
3. There are only so many vote centers per # of workers
4. Bill on Governor’s desk would require a central count
5. I learned so much, further understanding about Precinct vs.Vote Center & how absentee count could work in both
6. Flexibility of vote centers and various types of voting
7. The amount of people needed to make elections work using our current technology; the
rising number of voters voting by absentee
8. Provisional ballot counts, voting equipment costs from 2002

What topics or concepts need further discussion and explanation?
1. Projected cost of new machines; mechanics of how new machines differ from current M1000
2. Security of the process; more training for workers
3. Location of center, breakdown of set-ups & tear down
4. What are the differences in the requirements for vote centers vs. precincts?
5. Costs, technology options
6. Why would the 600 precincts be needed in a vote center model?
7. Technology available and how it can improve the voter process in Marion County
8. What are the vendors/companies are under consideration to help with the voting process?

What additional materials or data can we provide to make this process more helpful & meaningful?
1. Cost comparisons
2. Information from counties that have used vote centers
3. It would be nice to have someone from another county that uses vote centers come in & talk about the pros & cons
4. Vote machines, options
5. What technology is currently available; what would it be able to do for precinct voting or vote centers?
6. Information regarding technology that is available
7. All data related to the companies & products under consideration

Audience Feedback
1. Any new voting system should continue to have paper ballots to preserve the possibility of having a re-count if required. I’m very proud of my service as a poll worker, and feel the current system has integrity. I want to continue to feel good about the system I vote with and take an oath to work within.
Presentation Feedback
Slide 8: What is the minimum number of precincts needed in Marion County? (Applying the Indiana law of 1200 voters per precinct divided by approximately 640,000 registered voters, the minimum is about 534 precincts.)
Slide 14: Why fewer polling locations in last election than previous elections? Why are there 3 non-voting precincts? (They exist to encompass large parcels like the reservoir, speedway, airport.)
Slide 15: Can we work with superintendents of school districts as individual school administrators create issues on Election Day by changing entrances to voting, etc.?
Slide 16: Are people leaving political yard signs on polling location property violating any local ordinances or the terms of the contract? Are polling locations vetted before they are assigned? General comment to encourage visiting the sites before making assignment to ensure they are viable for Election Day voting.
Slide 19: Is it practically possible to find 3 sites per 25 council districts to accommodate up to 10,000 voters?
Slide 22: Have there been concerns about security at polling locations? (Nothing reported to the Election Board directly.)
Slide 39: Is there a hidden population of voters with disabilities not participating on Election Day? Do many voters with disabilities opt to use absentee voting than vote at a precinct? Is the lack of participation by people with disabilities due to not registering to vote, lacking ID or non-accessible sites?
Slide 45: What is the technology needed to aid in connectivity for vote center counties like Austin, Texas?
Slide 49: Are employers required to give employees time off to vote on Election Day?

Responses to Questionnaire
Question 1: What stood out to you in the best practices for polling place selection?
1. Accessibility and familiarity
2. Get school superintendent and/or school board members onboard to help with any school principal issues; preview a precinct voting site prior to approval
3. Accessibility is vital
4. All the steps involved in selecting sites
5. Importance of making sure all is accessible
6. Ability to create ‘super’ precincts
7. Sending out contractual agreements to polling place locations; enhanced requirements is good idea
8. Mail-in ballot option in Fort Collins, CO (i.e. Colorado’s law permitting a standing request to vote absentee)
9. Public; accessible; familiarity
10. Accessible restrooms; number of car/van parking spaces for those who have disabilities

**Question 2:** If you were advising the Election Board directly, what is important to you and your organization/constituents regarding polling place selection and accessibility?

1. Selecting locations that are ADA/HAVA compliant that also have adequate parking
2. Convenience; clearly marked; an absence of confusion; an air of welcomeness; well-informed and well-trained poll workers
3. Keep it local and as close to the center of the precinct as possible
4. Opportunities for early voting are essential to full access to voting
5. Convenient for voters
6. Drive through voting service for those with mobility challenges
7. Convenience for the voter; ability to encourage more voter participation
8. Feedback from voters
9. Early voting options seem to help make voting easier, whether for precinct or vote centers
10. Flow of polling space; compliant host staff on site
11. Ease of access for pedestrians via sidewalks; parking count for disability parking
12. Important that selection of voting locations & its access allows those who want to vote to do so; with as little bias to outcome as possible

**Question 3:** After the group discussion on question 2, please note your top three (or more) points about polling place locations and accessibility.

1. Accessibility must be complete and includes many factors; vote centers do not appear to likely improve accessibility; familiarity with location cannot be minimized as an important factor & can help the voter plan ahead
2. Parking; access to building; access to machines
3. Adequate space for people/parking; accessibility of sites, equipment; consistency of locations is important; any change requires public education
4. Accessibility; parking; extended hours
5. Parking availability; liability; floor plan
6. Located in ‘high traffic’ areas; ease of egress; recognition that different sites can accommodate different voters; i.e. walk-up, driving, bus
7. Proximity to polling place & disability accessible; parking; unknown if those with disability cannot go to voting site
8. Bullet points listed above PLUS accessible guaranteed path from parking lot
9. Fully accessible route to polls; ease of access to main entry; restroom facilities
10. Seems likely that those with disabilities are under-represented & may be intimidated by access concerns; technology may help address intimidation if used proactively to collect votes

**Question 4:** Anything else you would like to note.

1. Poll worker training can improve the process; it should start early
2. Since there are 9 townships, how many polling locations would you possibly have in each township?
3. Does the Mayor’s office currently control the polling locations? In vote centers would this then be the duty of the Election Board?
4. Polling sites should be free of bias/not promote self-reflection of voters in one way or another; virtual polling should be considered as a pro-active measure to reduce physical burden on polling locations & make voting more accessible for those with disabilities

**General Information Section**

**Question 1: What new information did you hear tonight?**
1. Horses can be service animals
2. Experience in other states with vote centers
3. ADA and election process
4. How the Mayor’s office deals with polling locations
5. Requirements for accessible locations
6. There is a place (Austin) that made it work by transitioning current polling sites; I want to hear more about this
7. Challenges and methods of approving voting sites

**Question 2: What topics or concepts need further discussion and explanation?**
1. We need to have access to sample voting machines & technology which we currently utilize. We need to see how machines work & understand what is required to make machines run.
2. Practicality of vote centers
3. Equipment accessibility: what voting equipment or set-up of stations would improve voter access?
4. Checklist for polling site requirements
5. Will vote centers save money or encourage higher turnout?
6. More about place like Austin; seems to have worked there and would here in Marion County
7. Allowable assistants (human or animal) approved for polling sites

**Question 3: What additional materials or data can we provide to make this process more helpful and meaningful?**
1. What options are there for expanded voting that uses current precincts? How about cost comparisons to vote centers?
2. Checklist for polling site requirements
3. Having the speaker from the Mayor’s office come in was information and listening to the other counties with vote centers will be helpful
4. More information about vote centers that work
5. Online access to notes made during meeting
Presentation Feedback

Slide 15: Does each machine print a tape or is it combined?
- Current system combines information from iVotronic and M100 and prints on one tape

Slide 19: How does the electronic media work on the M100 – do poll workers have to program?
- No – flash cards for iVotronic and M100 are burned prior to Election Day by the vendor specifically for the precinct and sealed in the machine.

Slide 19: How often do voters circle or check mark their bubbles on the ballot card?
- Not often, especially on Election Day but it’s more likely to occur on absentee ballots. If there is an error, the M100 is designed to ‘spit out’ the ballot so that the voter and/or precinct election board can correct the issue to the extent possible for the machine to read it.

Slide 19: How hard or expensive is it to purchase a receipt printer for the iVotronic?
- Decision made with initial equipment purchase not to buy additional printer packs and use the printing function on the M100 to save money. Would need to find printer packs that would be compatible with the older generation of iVotronics and based on limited information available to our office, the cost varies between $800 to $1200.

Slide 19: Why pair the two machines?
- M100 optical scanner not HAVA compliant with respect to providing a confidential, independent voting experience for voters with disabilities. The county made the decision to remedy the issue by purchasing iVotronic touch screen machines and marry the two technologies together. Less expensive for Marion County to purchase the M100 for each precinct and an iVotronic for each polling location.

Slide 19: How long are paper ballots retained?
- 22 months pursuant to state retention schedule

Slide 23: Is there any technological intelligence in the M100?
- The PCMCIA card for each specific precinct drives the tabulation of the results, not the scanner itself.

Slide 23: How is a recount conducted? And does the machine tabulate results differently in the event there is one
- Recount processes are outlined in state law. If the court order requires a new accounting of the ballots, the court-appointed officials will review each ballot and determine if it should be counted again (ballots could be missing clerk initials, bubbles not completed properly, etc.) The machine will tabulate the ballots that are fed into it – which generally does change the results, though that’s not the direct result of equipment malfunction; rather, it’s a function of the number of ballots received by poll workers versus the number of ballots the recount team decides should be counted.

Slide 24: Do machines break down?
- Most reports of machines ‘breaking down’ on Election Day are a direct result of poll workers becoming confused and/or impatient so the equipment is not set up properly.
Election Board mechanics will replace the units to give poll workers more confidence, but it’s very rare that the machine is malfunctioning or can’t be reset.

Slide 24: Do the machines get deemed end of life?
- We don’t know of an instance where a vendor or manufacturer has defined an ‘end of life’ for a voting system as the term relates to information technology needs. However, you could argue whether or not the state certifies (or de-certifies) the equipment could fit the end-of-life definition.

Slide 24: How often do poll workers not shut down machines after the polls close Election Day?
- Rarely, there are a isolated reports every few elections where poll workers can’t or won’t shut down the machines after the polls close. Mechanics are sent to the site to address the issue and ensure poll workers can return their electronic media.

**Questionnaire Feedback**

**What are you and/or your organization’s top 5 requirements in a new voting system and why?**
- Replacement technology should be HAVA compliant but also employable by abled voters; replacement technology must be quicker than iVotronic if employed by abled voters.
- Accessible; Easy to use & understand; Secure system; Reasonable cost; Utilize newest technology so as to, hopefully, obtain equipment that will provide the longest useful life.
- Must be easy to understand, easy to use; Accessible to those with mobility, vision, hearing impairments, etc.; Equipment should be consistent from precinct to precinct/vote center; Should inspire confidence of voters; Ease/accuracy of count
- Easy to use, set-up; Able to handle multiple voters at a fast pace; Understanding of how to use the equipment; Training classes, CD and on television; Close locations, be nice to have a drive-up service for voters
- Improves upon current system; Expands voter opportunities to vote
- Accuracy of results; Efficiency of machines; Low cost repair, maintenance, updates, etc.; Flexibility to change systems if needed
- Efficient - a machine that may vote all precincts at once; Updated/up to date software and technology, able to use modern technology, very secure technology; Easily transportable, storable; Able to have a paper and electronic record
- Simplicity; Reliability; Convenience; Enabling as much voting on election day or less than one week before as possible; Fair
- Current technology that can serve the City/County for 7 to 10+ years; Flexibility in technology to adjust to changes in business needs; Ease of use for poll workers & voters to reduce errors/problems/frustrations & instills confidence
- Ballot security & paper trail, integrity & voting; Cost of purchase & maintenance throughout life of contract, cost to taxpayers; Awareness & technology & ability to update so that obsolesce can be minimized, fiscal responsibility; Internal hacking if machines were to be reworked, integrity and security of voting; Ease/ability of poll workers to properly set-up new equipment of Election Day
What new information did you hear tonight?
- Demonstration of two voting machines was enlightening
- I learned how to set up the machine and there is audio to listen to on how to vote.
- Requirement of an image of an electronic ballot to be saved.
- I heard that we are using severely outdated software and how badly it is holding us back.
- How much space is required to store/set-up all machines

What topics or concepts need further discussion and explanation?
- Poll worker training and recruitment. How will new technology deal with provisional ballots?
- I’m looking forward to learning more about what equipment/technology is available

What additional materials or data can we provide to make this process more helpful and meaningful?
- Costs; Technology/equipment options
- New technological advancements/improvements how long will new technology last?
- So far, this information is helpful. I’m looking forward to hearing more about what’s out there.
- Multiple choices of new equipment and information on each system
Questionnaire Feedback

Question 1: Given what you have learned so far, should MCEB purchase new voting equipment to replace its current voting system in the near terms – yes, no, not sure?
1. Current equipment is obsolete. At some point the need for new machines will force a new path be taken.
2. Yes.
3. Not sure. Cost. Timing of the new voting equipment. People will need to be trained and voters will need to be educated.
5. Yes & No. YES - Equipment is outdated. Advances in security & technology. SB 621 requires it. Support/spare parts. NO – budget concerns/funding.
6. Yes. The equipment is too outdated to NOT be updated. In addition, with the passing of SB 621, it will be impossible to count absentee ballots in a timely manner.
7. Yes. For efficiency.
8. Not sure the advancements will outweigh the costs.
9. Yes.
10. Yes. Integrity and security of electronic voting processes are improving and are more reliable. SB 621 requires the change to the election process.

Question 1 Discussion During Meeting:
- Yes:
  - Equipment is outdated
  - Given advances in technology, especially security, would be beneficial
  - SB621 requires a change in voting system given current equipment parameters
  - Limited availability of replacement parts for current system
  - Democratic society can’t afford to vote, are we still a democratic society?
- No:
  - Technology is moving forward, changing and what we purchase now may not be workable in the future
  - Budget $$ may not be available; availability of funding difficult
- Not sure:
  - Advancements in newer equipment may not justify the expense
  - Political parties should fund their own primaries, which may help fund new equipment or advancements in voting technology

Question 2: What are your concerns, if any, utilizing a primarily ballot-card focused system in the future?
1. Printing. Printing costs also. Concerns with physical storage & warehousing of ballots.
2. Cost. It is necessary to purchase/prepare ballots that will not be needed.
3. Timing & cost
4. Determining voter intent if marked incorrectly.
5. 1) cost, 2) time consuming, 3) storage (physical), 4) impede forward progress, 5) less accessible
6. Fixed voter location. Printing/Storage
7. Cost for storage & production
8. Tedious, complicated; time consuming; physical storage; less accessible for voters with disabilities.
9. ?
10. Time consuming and expensive. Printing & physical storage is an issue. Less accessible for people with
disabilities.

**Question 2 Discussion During Meeting:**
- Printing ballots can be tedious & complicated
- Time consuming process to collate ballot information (before to create them, to distribute to precincts & pull together when polls close)
- Physical storage
- Impede process to other technologies, especially as it limits voters to one location to vote on Election Day
- Less accessible for voters with disabilities

**Question 3: What would be your concerns, if any, if the MCEB were to switch to a primarily electronic (paperless) voting system in the future?**
1. Possible outside fraud. System failure, also if there is a natural disaster or major power (or infrastructure) interruption.
2. Will the system allow proper review, i.e.: contests & recounts? How will provisional voting occur?
3. There needs to be a paper trail in case there is a recount.
4. Potentially more expensive to maintain.
5. 1) confidence with voters, 2) provisional ballots, 3) weather, electricity, etc. (system fails), 4) elderly population considerations
6. System failing; lack of paper trail
7. Fraud; security; recounts
8. Distrust of technology that may affect voters confidence; system failures; lack of paper train; older voters limited exposure
9. Opposed
10. Back-up for validation (lack of paper trail); considering the elderly or non-tech voters to be included

**Question 3 Discussion During Meeting:**
- Distrust of the technology may lead to less confidence in system by voters
- How would provisional ballots be segregated/implemented in a totally paperless system
- System fails – then what?
- Lack of a paper trail
  - System is hacked or somehow infiltrated then paperless system more difficult to validate election results
- Older voters may have limited exposure to technology and be unsure of using
- Electronic system may be more expensive to purchase, maintain
  - Software and other back-end systems may be impacted, too
- Does a recount exist in an all electronic environment?
Question 4: If MCEB were to utilize a “combination” system would you prefer it to produce or use a paper ballot read by a scanner or an electric ballot for which a “receipt” could be printed and retained by the election board? Why?
1. Paper ballot appears to permit review; post-election audits.
2. Depends upon cost and state law/legal precedent requirement for audit trail to mitigate legal challenges.
3. Difficult to answer at this time given that I don’t know what systems are available or how they work. Electronic voting systems should be able to provide a paper trail to meet needs.
4. Not enough information to make comments but worth discussing

Question 4 Discussion During Meeting:
- Big brother
- Random ‘save’ features of an electronic ballot to not be able to identify the voter’s selection
- Some voters may not be comfortable with touchscreen – familiarity of paper ballot
- Potential for a touchscreen system to print a paper ballot and hold internally without voter touching it
  - Intelligent systems can produce a paper trail without a paper ballot
- How do you define a paper trail?
  - Some states perform post election audits submitted to state and reviewed as to official count on the machine on Election Day and later confirming the machine has same number many months after the election
- Not enough information to answer this question?

Question 5: What do you feel should be the Election Board’s primary concerns when evaluating voting systems for purchase? (rank three)
1. 1) security/integrity & 2) accuracy & 3) cost
2. 1) cost, expense & 2) easy access for voters (training on voting system) & 3) paper trail
3. 1) cost & 2) security & 3) accuracy
4. 1) efficiency & 2) cost effectiveness & 3) security
5. 1) security/integrity, 2) easy to use, 3) cost
6. 1) accessibility, 2) security, 3) cost
7. 1) security; 2) ease of use; 3) cost; 4) integrity
8. 1) security; 2) ease of use; 3) accuracy & integrity
9. 1) security

Question 5 Discussion During Meeting:
- Security
- Ease of use
- Accuracy
- Cost

Questions for Travis County, Texas Director of Elections
- What do they wish they knew more about prior to initiating current technology?
- What is their biggest fear regarding their current system?
- What has been their biggest surprise, pleasant & negative, in terms of implementation of the current system?
- What is the size of the average staff/pollworkers at each center?
- What are the differences in costs?
- How long does it take for results?
- What questions and concerned did you have when moving to vote centers?
- And were those concerns justified by your experience?
- What methodology did you use to select equipment and procedures for elections?
Why did you decide to go to the vote centers? What was the main reason?
Voter Acceptance?
Was the switch made before or after the primary or general election?
What have been the biggest advantages?
What have been the negatives?
Cost savings realized or overall cost increase?
Voter feedback on election systems?
What functionality issues have you had and how did they affect the election?
What was the initial reaction by voters to your new voting system?
Did the positives outweigh the negatives?
What technology do you use & how does it work?
Certification process – what is it?
Challenges to your election – how many & what are they?
What hasn’t worked with the Vote Centers? And what are you changing?
Did anything happen with a vote center election that was unexpected?
Would you recommend vote centers to other counties?
Transition issues
Voter Acceptance
Unexpected/unanticipated items

What new information did you hear tonight?
1. There are different levels of certification. Federal law seems to permit different levels of certification.
2. Less expensive to go to electronic than paper base system. Indiana does not require paper trail.
3. Certification of voting machines
4. Paper trails are not required in Indiana
5. Certification process – how it works & what’s required by law.
6. Certification process for election systems

What topics or concepts need further discussion and explanation?
1. Cost. When would this need to take place? Off year, before a primary or general?
2. What technology is out there; what should we be considering?
3. What systems are available & how do they work.
4. Costs; price tag & possible ways to fund it.
5. Ability to “(can’t read this word but in quotes” & security
6. Best ways to education public on voting system changes & correct misinformation.

What additional materials or data can we provide to make this process more helpful and meaningful?
1. Costs; Technology/equipment options
2. New technological advancements/improvements how long will new technology last?
3. Looking forward to hearing from next weeks guests.
4. Ask Bowen Center to compile information about which voting system(s) has proven to be the most efficient & reliable & easy to use. Do voluntary voting system guidelines exist? Are there best practices that can help guide discussions and decision-making?
Other Handouts

- Module 1
  - Jurisdictional Information
  - Current Vote Center Laws (through June 30, 2013)
- Module 2
  - Bond Resolution for 2002 Equipment Purchase
- Module 3
  - Sample Polling Location Contract
- Module 5
  - ePollbook Requirements (as outlined in SEA519, 2013)
- Module 6
  - Questions for Election Administrators
  - Marion County, Ind. Election Fact Sheet
  - Floyd County, Ind. Election Fact Sheet
  - Tippecanoe County, Ind. Election Fact Sheet
  - Travis County, Tex. Election Fact Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City or County (County Seat)</th>
<th>US Rank</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area (sq miles)</th>
<th>Pop Density (per sq mi)</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>Precincts</th>
<th>Vote Centers</th>
<th>Polling Locations</th>
<th># of Vote Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA County, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,889,056</td>
<td>4,752.00</td>
<td>2,100.00</td>
<td>4,593,621</td>
<td>4,993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,621</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City, NY (All 5 Counties)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,336,697</td>
<td>468.50</td>
<td>27,550.00</td>
<td>4,640,422</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook County, IL (Suburban)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,217,080</td>
<td>1,635.00</td>
<td>5,514.90</td>
<td>1,416,811</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA (City)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,819,702</td>
<td>503.00</td>
<td>8,092.00</td>
<td>1,977,237</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL (City)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,707,120</td>
<td>234.00</td>
<td>11,864.40</td>
<td>1,364,371</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County, OH (Columbus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,178,799</td>
<td>543.00</td>
<td>2,186.00</td>
<td>808,578</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis County, TX (Austin)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,063,130</td>
<td>1,022.00</td>
<td>27,550.00</td>
<td>4,640,422</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis/Marion County</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>911,296</td>
<td>403.00</td>
<td>2,280.00</td>
<td>640,675</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville/Duval County, FL (consolidated)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>870,709</td>
<td>918.00</td>
<td>1,117.00</td>
<td>559,575</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco County, CA (consolidated)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>812,826</td>
<td>231.90</td>
<td>17,179.20</td>
<td>502,841</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernalillo County, NM (Albuquerque)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>670,968</td>
<td>1,169.00</td>
<td>566.80</td>
<td>429,878</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver/Denver County, CO (consolidated)**</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>634,265</td>
<td>154.90</td>
<td>4,044.00</td>
<td>483,363</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1/10 precincts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County, IN (Crown Point)</td>
<td></td>
<td>495,558</td>
<td>626.56</td>
<td>998.00</td>
<td>339,869</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen County, IN (Ft. Wayne)</td>
<td></td>
<td>358,327</td>
<td>660.00</td>
<td>541.00</td>
<td>254,398</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimer County, CO (Ft. Collins)</td>
<td></td>
<td>305,525</td>
<td>2,634.00</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>241,124</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County, IN (Evansville)</td>
<td></td>
<td>180,305</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>142,899</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe County, IN (Lafayette)</td>
<td></td>
<td>174,724</td>
<td>503.00</td>
<td>346.00</td>
<td>106,767</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County, IN (Franklin)</td>
<td></td>
<td>141,656</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>96,209</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd County, IN (New Albany)</td>
<td></td>
<td>74,989</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>56,421</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County, IN (Richmond)</td>
<td></td>
<td>68,643</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>44,983</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass County, IN (Logansport)</td>
<td></td>
<td>38,828</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22,212</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette County, IN (Connersville)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,285</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17,181</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackford County, IN (Hartford City)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,594</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8,904</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TX Code 4-43.007: Number of vote centers determined by methodology - may not be less than 50% of the number of precinct polling locations used in the same type of election, unless this is the first time vote centers are used and then the methodology increases to at least 65%
Indiana Vote Center Plan Requirements

Designation of county as vote center county; adoption of vote center order and plan (IC 3-11-18.1-3)

Sec. 3. (a) A county must comply with this section to become a vote center county.
(b) As used in this section, “board” refers to any of the following:
   (1) The county election board.
   (2) The board of elections and registration established under IC 3-6-5.2 or IC 3-6-5.4.
   (c) The board shall hold a public hearing to present a draft plan for administration of vote centers in the county.
   (d) After presentation of the draft plan under subsection (c), the board shall accept written public comments on the draft plan.
   (e) At least thirty (30) days after the hearing held under subsection (c), the board shall hold a public hearing to consider the following:
      (1) The draft plan.
      (2) The written public comments.
      (3) Any other public comment that the board may permit on the draft plan.
   (f) After consideration of the draft plan and the public comments, the board may do the following:
      (1) Adopt an order approving the draft plan.
      (2) Amend the draft plan and adopt an order approving the amended draft plan.
   The board may adopt the order to approve a plan only by unanimous vote of the entire membership of the board.
   (g) All members of the board must sign the order adopting the plan.
   (h) The order and the adopted plan must be filed with the election division and must include a copy of:
      (1) a resolution adopted by the county executive; and
      (2) a resolution adopted by the county fiscal body;
   approving the designation of the county as a vote center county.
As added by P.L.1-2011, SEC.3.

Vote center plan; requirements (IC 3-11-18.1-4)

Sec. 4. The plan required by section 3 of this chapter must include at least the following:
   (1) The total number of vote centers to be established.
   (2) The location of each vote center.
   (3) The effective date of the order.
   (4) The following information according to the computerized list (as defined in IC 3-7-26.3-2) as of the date of the order:
      (A) The total number of voters within the county.
      (B) The number of active voters within the county.
      (C) The number of inactive voters within the county.
   (5) For each vote center designated under subdivision (2), a list of the precincts whose polls will be located at the vote center consistent with section 13 of this chapter.
   (6) For each vote center designated under subdivision (2), the number of precinct election boards that will be appointed to administer an election at the vote center.
   (7) For each precinct election board designated under subdivision (6), the number and name of each precinct the precinct election board will administer consistent with section 13 of this chapter.
   (8) For each vote center designated under subdivision (2), the number and title of the precinct election officers who will be appointed to serve at the vote center.
   (9) For each vote center designated under subdivision (2):
(A) the number and type of ballot variations that will be provided at the vote center; and
(B) whether these ballots will be:
   (i) delivered to the vote center before the opening of the polls; or
   (ii) printed on demand for a voter's use.
(10) A detailed description of any hardware, firmware, or software used:
   (A) to create an electronic poll list for each precinct whose polls are to be located at a vote center; or
   (B) to establish a secure electronic connection between the county election board and the precinct election officials administering a vote center.
(11) A description of the equipment and procedures to be used to ensure that information concerning a voter entered into any electronic poll list used by precinct election officers at a vote center is immediately accessible to:
   (A) the county election board; and
   (B) the electronic poll lists used by precinct election officers at all other vote centers in the county.
(12) For each precinct designated under subdivision (5), the number of electronic poll lists to be provided for the precinct.
(13) The security and contingency plans to be implemented by the county to do all of the following:
   (A) Prevent a disruption of the vote center process.
   (B) Ensure that the election is properly conducted if a disruption occurs.
   (C) Prevent access to an electronic poll list without the coordinated action of two (2) precinct election officers who are not members of the same political party.
(14) A certification that the vote center complies with the accessibility requirements applicable to polling places under IC 3-11-8.
(15) A sketch depicting the planned layout of the vote center, indicating the location of:
   (A) equipment; and
   (B) precinct election officers;
   within the vote center.
(16) The total number and locations of satellite offices to be established under IC 3-11-10-26.3 at vote center locations designated under subdivision (2) to allow voters to cast absentee ballots in accordance with IC 3-11. However, a plan must provide for at least one (1) vote center to be established as a satellite office under IC 3-11-10-26.3 on the two (2) Saturdays immediately preceding an election day.
(17) The method and timing of providing voter data to persons who are entitled to receive the data under this title. Data shall be provided to all persons entitled to the data without unreasonable delay.


Use of vote centers (IC 3-11-18.1-5)

Sec. 5. A plan must provide a vote center for use by voters residing within the county for use in a primary election, general election, special election, municipal primary, or municipal election conducted on or after the effective date of the county election board's order.

As added by P.L.1-2011, SEC.3.
SIGNATURE AND NO LITIGATION CERTIFICATE

We, the undersigned officers of The Indianapolis Local Public Improvement Bond Bank, do hereby certify that we have officially signed the Note described as follows:

Designation: The Indianapolis Local Public Improvement Bond Bank Limited Obligation Notes, Series 2003 A ("Note")

Total Issue: One fully registered Note in the aggregate principal amount not to exceed $11,100,000

Dated: March 27, 2003

Interest Payable: On March 1 and September 1 of each year, commencing on September 1, 2003

Interest Rate: At the per annum rate of 1.60%

Maturity Date: March 1, 2004

being on the date of such signing and on the date hereof, the duly chosen, qualified and acting officers authorized to execute the Note and holding the offices indicated by the official titles opposite our names.

We further certify that there is no litigation of any nature now pending, or to our knowledge threatened in any way, relating to, affecting or questioning the issuance, sale, execution or delivery of the Note, or of any of the proceedings had or actions taken leading up to the execution and delivery of the same, or the payment of the interest on or principal of the Note, or otherwise affecting or questioning the validity of the Note; that the title of the undersigned officers to their respective offices is not being contested, and that no proceedings or authority for the issuance, sale, execution or delivery of the Note have or has been amended, rescinded or revoked.

The signatures appearing on the Note, Resolution No. 1-2003 adopted by the Bond Bank on February 10, 2003, the Loan and Security Agreement dated March 27, 2003 between the Bond Bank and Bank One, NA, and the Qualified Entity Purchase Agreement dated March 27, 2003 between Marion County, Indiana and the Bond Bank, all as more fully described and contained in the transcript of which this certificate is a part, as that of the Chairman and the Executive Director of the Bond Bank, are the genuine signatures of John J. Dillon III and Robert J. Clifford, respectively, and they are now and were at the dates of execution thereof the duly elected and acting Chairman and the duly appointed and acting Executive Director, respectively, of the Bond Bank.
The undersigned further certify that the signature or signatures appearing on the Note are our true and genuine signatures, which appear below.

We further certify that the seal which has been affixed, imprinted or impressed upon the Note and upon this certificate is the legally adopted, proper and only official corporate seal.

(SEAL)

WITNESS our hands and the corporate seal this 27th day of March, 2003.

Signatures          Official Titles

[Signature]        Chairman

[Signature]        Executive Director
MARION COUNTY / CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS 2012 POLLING SITE CONTRACT

Unless otherwise indicated, this contract is valid for both the:

▸ Primary Election — Tuesday, May 8, 2012
▸ General Election — Tuesday, November 6, 2012

Machine delivery will be made by geographic area during the 11 working days preceding the election dates, and pick up will occur during the 11 working days following the election dates, between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.
For questions regarding machine delivery or pick-up, please call 327-3685 between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

BY FEDERAL AND STATE STATUTES, POLLING SITES MUST BE ACCESSIBLE TO PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.
(Lessor agrees that poll workers may be required to post signs in building and on lawn outside the facility.
Lessor shall not block or obstruct access to the polling site.)

1. Name of Polling Building: Arlington Ave. Baptist Church
   (This will appear in all advertising)
   6410 S. Arlington Ave.

2. Address of Polling Place: Indianapolis, IN 46237

3. Location of Polling Place in Building: (i.e.: Gym, Recreation Room, etc.) Sunday School Room / Fellowship Hall

4. Lessor’s “Mailing” Address (if different than above)

5. Name of Contact Person for Contracts: Rev. Richard Walton
   Phone #: Fax #: E-Mail: richardwalton@comcast.net

6. Will poll workers have access to a phone? Yes _ No Phone # at Polling Place: 317-787-3109

7. Name and phone number of at least two (2) people who have access to the building at all times:
   Name: Tim Turner Phone: 
   Name: Kevin Cleary Phone:

8. Will someone be on premise at 5:00 a.m. to open building? Yes _ No Key Pick Up Needed? Yes _ No
   (A key must be made available the evening before the election if no one can be on premise to allow the poll workers access by 5:00 am Election Day.

9. Comments & Special Arrangements: we can make a key available if desired

10. Will the facility be able to provide ___ tables and ___ chairs? Yes _ (If No, how many?)

I, the undersigned, do hereby agree to furnish the space indicated on this contract for the purpose of voting and vote tabulation on the Election Days indicated (5:00 a.m. – 8:00 p.m.). I understand that the polling site must allow members of the public to conduct reasonable electioneering and other political speech activities onsite at the location, including but not limited to distribution of flyers and posting signs, within the limitations prescribed by law. I understand the sum of $40.00 per election will be paid to any non-public building for providing this service.

Paid for Use: YES _ NO 

County Executive or Designee: Jennifer Poole

Lessor’s Signature: Richard Walton Printed Name: Pastor

Title:
ELECTRONIC POLL BOOK REQUIREMENTS
SEA519 | 2013 LEGISLATIVE SESSION | JULY 1, 2013 EFFECTIVE DATE

SECTION 75. IC 3-11-8-10.3, AS AMENDED BY HEA 1311-2013, SECTION 17, IS AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2013]: Sec. 10.3. (a) As used in this section, "electronic poll list" refers to a poll list that is maintained in a computer data base.

(b) An electronic poll list must satisfy all of the following:

(1) An electronic poll list must be programmed so that the coordinated action of two (2) election officers who are not members of the same political party is necessary to access the electronic poll list.

(2) An electronic poll list may not be connected to a voting system.

(3) An electronic poll list may not permit access to voter information other than:

(A) information provided on the certified list of voters prepared under IC 3-7-29-1; or

(B) information concerning any of the following received or issued after the electronic poll list has been downloaded by the county election board under IC 3-7-29-6:

(i) The county's receipt of an absentee ballot from the voter.

(ii) The county's receipt of additional documentation provided by the voter to the county voter registration office.

(iii) The county's issuance of a certificate of error.

(4) The information contained on an electronic poll list must be encrypted and placed on a dedicated, private server to secure connectivity between a precinct polling place or satellite absentee office and the county election board. The electronic poll book must have the capability of:

(A) storing a local version of the data base that serves as a backup; and

(B) producing a list of audit records that reflect all of the idiosyncrasies of the system, including in-process audit records that set forth all transactions.

(5) The electronic poll list must permit a poll clerk to enter information regarding an individual who has appeared to vote to verify whether the individual is eligible to vote, and if so, whether the voter has:

(A) already cast a ballot at the election;

(B) returned an absentee ballot; or

(C) submitted any additional documentation required under IC 3-7-33-4.5.

(6) After the voter has been provided with a ballot, the electronic poll list must permit a poll clerk to enter information indicating that the voter has voted at the election.

(7) The electronic poll list must transmit the information in subdivision (6) to the county election board so that the board may transmit the information immediately to every other polling place or satellite absentee office in the county in which an electronic poll list is being used.

(8) The electronic poll list must permit reports to be:

(A) generated by a county election board for a watcher appointed under IC 3-6-8 at any time during election day; and

(B) electronically transmitted by the county election board to a political party or independent candidate who has appointed a watcher under IC 3-6-8.

(9) After election day, the electronic poll list must permit voter history to be quickly and accurately uploaded into the computerized list.
(10) The electronic poll list must be able to display an electronic image of the signature of a voter taken from the voter's registration application, if available.

(11) The electronic poll list must be used with a signature pad, tablet, or other signature capturing device that permits the voter to make an electronic signature for comparison with the signature displayed under subdivision (10). An image of the electronic signature made by the voter on the signature pad, tablet, or other signature capturing device must be retained and identified as the signature of the voter for the period required for retention under IC 3-10-1-31.1.

(12) The electronic poll list must include a bar code reader or tablet that:
   (A) permits a voter who presents an Indiana driver's license or a state identification card issued under IC 9-24-16 to scan the license or card through the bar code reader or tablet; and
   (B) has the capability to display the voter's registration record upon processing the information contained within the bar code on the license or card.

(13) The electronic poll list must be compatible with:
   (A) any hardware attached to the poll book, such as signature pads, bar code scanners, and network cards;
   (B) the statewide voter registration system; and
   (C) any software system used to prepare voter information to be included on the electronic poll list.

(14) The electronic poll list must have the ability to be used in conformity with this title for:
   (A) any type of election conducted in Indiana; or
   (B) any combination of elections held concurrently with a general election, municipal election, primary election, or special election.

(15) The procedures for setting up, using, and shutting down an electronic poll list must:
   (A) be reasonably easy for a precinct election officer to learn, understand, and perform; and
   (B) not require a significant amount of training in addition to the training required by IC 3-6-6-40.

(16) The electronic poll list must enable a precinct election officer to verify that the electronic poll list:
   (A) has been set up correctly;
   (B) is working correctly so as to verify the eligibility of the voter;
   (C) is correctly recording that a voter has voted; and
   (D) has been shut down correctly.

(17) The electronic poll list must include the following documentation:
   (A) Plainly worded, complete, and detailed instructions sufficient for a precinct election officer to set up, use, and shut down the electronic poll list.
   (B) Training materials that:
      (i) may be in written or video form; and
      (ii) must be in a format suitable for use at a polling place, such as simple "how to" guides.
   (C) Failsafe data recovery procedures for information included in the electronic poll list.
   (D) Usability tests:
      (i) that are conducted by the manufacturer of the electronic poll list using individuals who are representative of the general public;
      (ii) that include the setting up, using, and shutting down of the electronic poll list; and
(iii) that report their results using the ANSI/INCITS -354 Common Industry Format (CIF) for Usability Test Reports approved by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) on December 12, 2001.

(E) A clear model of the electronic poll list system architecture and the following documentation:
   (i) End user documentation.
   (ii) System-level documentation.
   (iii) Developer documentation.

(F) Detailed information concerning:
   (i) electronic poll list consumables; and
   (ii) the vendor's supply chain for those consumables.

(G) Vendor internal quality assurance procedures and any internal or external test data and reports available to the vendor concerning the electronic poll list.

(H) Repair and maintenance policies for the electronic poll list.

(I) As of the date of the vendor's application for approval of the electronic poll list by the secretary of state as required by IC 3-11-18.1-12(2), the following:
   (i) A list of customers who are using or have previously used the vendor's electronic poll list.
   (ii) A description of any known anomalies involving the functioning of the electronic poll list, including how those anomalies were resolved.

(18) The electronic poll list and any hardware attached to the poll book must be designed to prevent injury or damage to any individual or the hardware, including fire and electrical hazards.

(19) The electronic poll list must demonstrate that it correctly processes all activity regarding each voter registration record included on the list, including the use, alteration, storage, and transmittal of information that is part of the record. Compliance with this subdivision requires the mapping of the data life cycle of the voter registration record as processed by the electronic poll list.

(20) The electronic poll list must successfully perform in accordance with all representations concerning functionality, usability, security, accessibility, and sustainability made in the vendor's application for approval of the electronic poll list by the secretary of state as required by IC 3-11-18.1-12(2).

(21) The electronic poll list must have the capacity to transmit all information generated by the voter or poll clerk as part of the process of casting a ballot, including the time and date stamp indicating when the voter voted, and the electronic signature of the voter, for retention on the dedicated private server maintained by the county election board for the period required by Indiana and federal law.

(22) The electronic poll list must successfully perform in accordance with all representations concerning functionality, usability, security, accessibility, and sustainability made in the vendor's application for approval of the electronic poll list by the secretary of state as required by IC 3-11-18.1-12(2).

(23) The electronic poll list must:
   (A) permit a voter to sign the poll list even when there is a temporary interruption in connectivity to the Internet; and
   (B) provide for the uploading of each signature and its assignment to the voter's registration record.
1. Why did you decide to change from precinct-based elections to vote centers?

2. What was the timing of transition – in an off-year, between a primary/general election?

3. Mr. Winn & Clerk Coffey – your county has been using vote centers for several years. What’s worked? What hasn’t? Have you modified or made significant changes to your vote center plans?

4. Where have you seen cost savings, if any?

5. Talk to us about early voting in your community – how long? How many sites? Does it help with your Election Day administration?

6. Floyd County Q: Travis County and Tippecanoe counties use direct recording electronic equipment – similar to our iVotronic but not the same – and Floyd County is moving to a combination system, which will be used for the first time in a special election this fall. The group has a general understanding of how the DRE works. Clerk Moeller – can you tell us a little about your system?

7. How accepting were voters of vote centers and any changes to voting technology?

8. How accepting were poll workers to the change in voting equipment, including ePollbooks?

9. What other groups raised concerns before, during or after the transition?

10. How involved are party officials in selecting poll workers?
Marion County, Indiana | Beth White, Clerk

County Statistics:
- County Population: 918,977 (2012 Census estimate)
- Cities & Towns: Indianapolis-Marion County; excluded cities of Speedway, Beech Grove, Lawrence and Southport; smaller towns like Crow’s Nest, Cumberland, Clermont, Warren Park, etc.

Voter Registration & Precinct Information
- Total Registered Voters*: 640,675
- Total Precincts*: 600 (597 voting precincts)
- Total Vote Centers, if applicable*: n/a
- Total Polling Locations (current)*: 305
- Total Voters per Precinct/Vote Center*: n/a

Election Board Background
- Election Board Majority: Democrat (3-member board – 1D, 1R & Elected Clerk)
- Total Full-Time Staff: 7
- Total Budget*: about $1 million per election

Election Day Poll Workers:
- Total at Each Site*: 5
- Assigned by Political Parties: Yes
- Division of Poll Workers by Political Party: Inspector position is appointed by the political party of the Secretary of State candidate that won the county in the last SOS election; bi-partisan Clerks and Judges

Voting Equipment:
- Type(s) of Voting Equipment Used: ES&S M100 (optical scan) & iVotronic (direct recording electronic)
- Total Machines in Fleet: 737 M100; 613 iVotronic
- How many at each precinct during a presidential general election: 1 M100 per precinct; at least 1 iVotronic per polling location
- Type of Poll Books: paper

Absentee Voting & Provisional Ballots*:
- Total Absentee Votes: 59,036
- Absentee as a Percentage of Overall Voter Turnout: 16.33% (59,036 ABS/361,416 total votes)
- Number of Early Voting Locations (‘Satellite Voting’): 1 – Clerk’s Office
- Total Provisional Ballots: 947

*Information Based on 2012 Presidential Election
Floyd County, Indiana | Linda Moeller, Clerk

County Statistics
Population: 74,578
Cities & Towns: New Albany (county seat), Galena, Georgetown, Greenville

Voter Registration & Precinct Information
Total Registered Voters*: 55,966 (active voters – 53,851)
Total Precincts*: 60
Total Vote Centers: 10

Floyd County will be using vote centers for the first time in a November 2013 special election
Total Polling Locations (current or before vote centers)*: 60
Total Voters per Precinct/Vote Center: 5,286 (registered voters/vote centers)

Election Board Background
Election Board Majority: Democrat
Total Full-Time Staff: 3
Total Annual Budget*: $80,000 which includes poll works, machine techs, etc.

Election Day Poll Workers
Total at Each Vote Center: 5
Assigned by Political Parties: Yes
Division of Poll Workers by Political Party: One inspector from the same party as the Secretary of State candidate that won their county in last election and the remaining four will be divided evenly by Democrats and Republicans.

Voting Equipment & Pollbooks
Type(s) of Voting Equipment Used: RBM Openelect (Combination System)
Total Machines in Fleet: 15 Openelect (OVO) – optical scan reader; 60 Openelect (OVI) - touch screen
How many at each precinct/vote center: About 5 touch screen to record ballot; at least 1 scanner to read and tabulate ballots
Type of Poll Books: Electronic
How many ePollbooks at each vote center: 3

Absentee Voting & Provisional Ballots
Total Absentee Votes*: 5,187
Absentee as a Percentage of Overall Voter Turnout*: 5%
Number of Early Voting Locations ('Satellite Voting')**: 3
Total Provisional Ballots*: 68

*Information Based on 2012 Presidential Election
**Vote Center Plan as of Jan 1, 2013
Tippecanoe County, Indiana | Christa Coffey, Clerk

County Statistics
- County population: 172,780
- Cities and towns: Lafayette (county seat), West Lafayette, Dayton, Battle Ground, Clark’s Hill, Otterbein

Voter Registration & Precinct Information
- Number of Registered Voters*: 106,767
- Number of Precincts*: 116
- Number of Vote Centers: 19
- Tippecanoe County was one of three pilot vote center counties and first used the sites in 2007
- Number of polling locations previously: 70-85

Election Board Background
- Majority: Republican
- Total Full-time Staff*: 3
- Total Annual Budget*: $325,000 in 2012

Election Day Poll Workers
- How many at each site during a presidential general election*: Using vote centers, there were 103 total poll workers on Election Day; based on the size of the location, it varied between three and ten.
- Assigned by political parties: Yes
- Division of Poll Workers by Political Parties: One “Inspector-type” position from the same party as the Secretary of State candidate that won their county in last SOS election and remaining staff equally divided by the two major political parties

Voting Equipment
- Type of Voting Equipment used: Diebold AccuVoteTSx (Direct Recording Electronic)
- Total Machines in Fleet: 308
- How many at each site during a presidential general election*: Using vote centers, we also vary how much voting equipment per site; in 2012 we placed 289 AccuVote TSx machines among the 19 vote center. The smallest site had 4, the largest site had 25.
- Type of Poll Book: Electronic
- How many ePollbooks at each vote center during a presidential general election: 2-5

Absentee Voting & Provisional Ballots*
- Total Absentee Votes: 21,238
- Absentee as a percentage of Overall Voter Turnout: 37%
- Number of Early Voting Locations (Satellite Voting): 19
- Total Provisional Ballots: 336

*Information Based on 2012 Presidential Election
Travis County, Texas | Dana DeBeauvior, Clerk

County Statistics:
- County Population: 1,024,266
- Cities & Towns: Austin (county seat), Bee Cave, Briarcliff, Creedmoor, Jonestown, Lago Vista, Manor, Mustang Ridge, Pflugerville, Point Venture, Rollingwood, San Leanna, Sunset Valley, The Hills, Volente, Weberville, West Lake Hills

Voter Registration & Precinct Information
- Total Registered Voters*: 595,269
- Total Precincts*: 210
- Total Vote Centers, if applicable*: 157

  Travis County moved to vote centers in November 2012 election
- Total Polling Locations (current or before vote centers)*: 189
- Total Voters per Precinct/Vote Center*: 3,500

Election Board Background
- Election Board Majority: Democrat (elected)
- Total Full-Time Staff: 18
- Total Budget*: 1.3 million

Election Day Poll Workers:
- Total at Each Site*: 8
- Assigned by Political Parties: Yes, No
- Division of Poll Workers by Political Party: yes

Voting Equipment:
- Type(s) of Voting Equipment Used: eSlate (Direct Recording Electronic)
- Total Machines in Fleet: 1,725
- How many at each precinct/vote center during a presidential general election: 10
- Type of Poll Books: electronic
- How many ePollbooks at each vote center during a presidential general election*: 1 to 2 depending on size of site

Absentee Voting & Provisional Ballots*:
- Total Absentee Votes: 237,419
- Absentee as a Percentage of Overall Voter Turnout: 61% (237,419 ABS/391,708 total votes)
- Number of Early Voting Locations (‘Satellite Voting’): 23 static sites plus additional mobile locations
- Total Provisional Ballots: 3,800

*Information Based on 2012 Presidential Election