

Changes to agenda

- start w/ update about recent news
- Libby presents on legislative/legal issues

Liz intro

Josie addresses recent ADN story

- Becky Bohrer interview this am
- spoke w/ DHS, others in elections
- timeline
 - 6am Nov.
 - cyber actor got into website
 - dealt w/ immediately
 - Phillip worked to shut down server for website
 - per normal procedures
 - dealt w/ issue/threat at hand
 - determined didn't constitute compromise that would impact voting rights or any functions of day
 - public website doesn't affect election ops
 - focused on election day issues at hand
- if anything was going to impede voting/election, would have informed public
- why not made public? Josie/DOE wants to be open about why
- Phillip
 - incident affected 1 of 3 servers (and there are backups to that)
 - likely imperceptible to the public
 - read access to file system, which only had public info
 - attacked all the time, any given day (various forms of technical attacks)
 - only report attacks/intrusions that have material impact
 - not a big issue; very contained, actual access was much less than the intruder claimed
- David Becker
 - textbook example of how to handle
 - well-built system; isolated from election systems
 - use as model for other jurisdictions
 - systems constantly scanned/probed
- Josie closing
 - posted FAQ on website
 - protect integrity/security central to her role, takes very seriously
- Questions
 - Bruce

- Any evidence this “hacker” attempted intrusion of other states’ systems?
 - MS-ISAC handles looking at this, AK doesn’t have the info about whether this person has engaged efforts in other states
- Sen.
 - Possible to get information more proactively?
- John Lindback
 - reported to DHS?
 - yes, crimes or pos. crimes of this nature are reported
 - only website accessed, not elections systems, correct?
 - correct
 - plan/procedures in place to address issues like this?
 - yes, and plan was followed
 - does plan include info on reporting of incidents and who gets notice?
 - not aware of specific procedures for notification when system does not have PII
 - suggestion: consider review of info security management plan, include incident reporting process
 - most orgs in control of sensitive data have something like this
 - ***written policy of who gets notified under what circumstances would get ahead of the sorts of non-notification issues brought up today***
 - John willing to help w/ this — did so for ERIC

Libby legal update

Review from municipality of anchorage

- numbers
 - 208k postcards to voters to confirm mailing and residence addresses
 - 1/3/18
 - 3/13 - 194k ballot packages mailed
 - by election day +10, had received 79,205 ballots
 - most ever received in regular muni election
- similarities between elections, muni vs. state
 - muni works very hard to make processes/procedures very similar to state
 - worked closely w/ state for this election (getting data, records, etc.)
 - voters don’t know difference betw. muni and state, trying to make seamless
- voters well-informed of change to VBM (even if not everyone was onboard w/ the change)
- project scope
 - involved stakeholders, ensured buy in
 - needed to build in enough time to make new system while also ensuring that elections are properly executed
- questions

- Bruce: cost of vote; do you expect future elections will cost less?
 - outreach likely to continue
 - not much was actually spent here (relied on other MOA resources at little/no cost)
 - operational costs should go down now that initial capital costs have been addressed
 - biggest costs: printing and mailing
 - David: states that have implemented VBM or hybrid systems have shown decrease in costs over time (fewer provisionals, fewer poll workers, etc.)
 - increase in costs due to printing/mailing quickly offset by efficiencies/downsizing
- signature verification
 - used two-tiered human verification
 - election officials trained by expert
 - numbers
 - 100 signatures that could not be matched (out of 79k voters)
 - 66 no signatures
 - 779 cure letters sent out
- Randy: still a huge task ahead of MOA - only 36% turnout for muni election, need effective outreach for remaining ~30% of electorate that votes in higher profile elections
- David questions
 - postcard confirmation in January: were they forwardable?
 - yes, they were forwardable (not an NVRA mailing)
 - David: may not be an effective use of funds to try to reach out to voters in this way; PFD database and other databases (like motor vehicles) may be sufficient
 - Data on different ways ballots returned?
 - Yes, data collected on each drop box, vote center, by mail, etc.
 - 46% by mail (postage not prepaid)
 - 38% drop box
 - 14% accessible vote center (included a lot of people dropping off)
 - 2% electronic vote
 - David: this is consistent w/ other places
 - John Lindback
 - percentage of ballots that arrived after election day and before canvas?
 - at least 2000 postmarked before election day received before canvas
 - 294 postmarked after election day
- Liz: smaller sub-group willing to engage in discussion about MOA election?

- dive into how to leverage knowledge gained from MOA election
- Liz: CEIR analysis?
 - David: happy to work with MOA to develop some demographic analysis
 - age, zip code easy to do
 - other demos may be more complex, can look into later

ISER

- Methodology
 - combination: info Indra supplied re. registered voters in regions, worked w/ PFD for phone numbers
 - respond either online or by phone interview
 - open 2 weeks, mailed letters to each selected participant
 - few completed online
 - started calling after 3 weeks
 - 412 interviews completed
 - 70% response rate
 - took ~1.5 months for completed interviews
 - finished calls last Wednesday
 - only 2 people at ISER saw voter reg list; interviewers did not
- Results
 - not going to repeat (reference handout)
 - straight VBM not very popular
 - BP- perception of difficulties w/ voting substantially higher for others as compared to self
 - full report out in May
- Questions
 - conducted in English?
 - Yes

Review possible voting system options following vendor demonstrations

- Laurie Wilson
 - tech has come such a long way
 - solutions exist to resolve current problems experienced in AK
 - vendors responsive to client requests
- Jeremy Johnson
 - vendors pairing accessibility units with desktop printers - would require mailing printers to every location, which has challenges
 - takeaway: whatever vendor we go w/ will be big improvement
- Carol Thompson
 - helped implement optical scan in 1998
 - language needs important and were addressed
 - good progress for disabled voters

- longevity provided by COTS equipment is a plus
- Eugene
 - caught wind of demonstrations at late date - concerned about notice to public
 - Josie: vendor demos were largely internal, EPWG meeting is open meeting and was advertised
 - concerned about the fast track toward new equipment
- Jamie Newman
 - thanked Josie for partnering w/ muni clerks, inviting input
 - excited by tech
 - noted certification by EAC
- Beth, Juneau
 - exciting to see new tech
 - ranked: Dominion, ES&S at top
 - Dominion very responsive to AK's unique needs
- Nancy
 - this committee has a big lift in the next few years
 - likes flexibility in roll out of new equipment: e.g., can start w/ using as precinct then move to hybrid system
- Lauri Strickler
 - noted efficiencies the systems provide; will be phenomenal improvement
- Johni Blankenship
 - same sentiment as previous
 - ballot on demand concept is excellent
- Brian Jackson
 - Compare car from '98 to car from '18. such a big difference
 - we'll be happy no matter where we end up; all great solutions
- Claire
 - AK is a paper ballot system - paper ballot important component of voter confidence and security
 - pleasantly surprised by emphasis on paper ballots in vendor demos
- Josie wrapping up
 - \$3MM additional HAVA funds
 - additional \$2MM set aside from state and leftover HAVA funds
 - DE in final stages of procurement (similarly situated to AK; replacing dated Dominion voting system)
 - Looking at a timeline
- Liz: what does the process look like for new equipment?
 - full cost analysis
 - review legislative changes needed; draft legislation
 - outreach to legislators, municipalities, interest groups
 - listening to what other Alaskans think
- Comments/questions about vendor demos?

- Joelle: possible to be halfway in on this project? buy some to replace in farthest flung or most urban parts of AK? possible to do in phases? or impossible because of certain systems, etc.?
 - Josie: just exploring recently
 - legal hurdles: by statute, precinct-based system
- Where is EPWG currently at & what does it need?
 - Kacie Paxton
 - full cost analysis precursor to EPWG recommendation?
 - Joelle
 - consider potential phases (e.g., just replace existing equipment (no outreach, no legislative changes))
 - Josie
 - part of outreach to legislature
 - precinct: 6.77 million, 480k? annual fee
 - by mail: 2.1 million, 181k license warranty fee
 - modern hybrid: by mail plus cost of vote centers
 - DOE has pretty good idea of what cost savings would be
 - have evaluated costs, haven't done deep dive into individual options (but could if EPWG wants DOE to pursue that)
 - Bruce
 - need to start w/ decision regarding the change and when we want to make the change
 - need to know: what are the critical decisions, when do they need to be made (what order); what info is needed for those critical decisions
 - David: first decision is to decide when to roll it out
 - suggestion: roll out all at once, not in phases; realistic goal may be 2020 primaries (would need to evaluate possibility)
 - John
 - machines aren't going to last until 2022 or 2024—elections have become much more difficult than they need to be
 - Libby
 - personal opinion: equipment urgency is such that don't think we can rely on a Title 15 overhaul—work w/ statutes that we have and update the equipment under existing regime (don't wait for the legislature to act)
 - David
 - maintain flexibility as long as possible
 - Big difference in cost; should leverage to try to attain those cost savings if possible
 - Libby
 - pushed back on David: doesn't see legislative change happening soon
 - Nancy

- if state refuses to act, then municipalities will be forced to upgrade equipment creating disparate approaches from muni to muni
 - encourage unified state approach
- Liz: are these systems flexible enough to allow us to start w/ precinct based and change over to hybrid system?
 - Josie: important question to follow up w/ vendors
 - technology seems to be flexible enough; leasing option would allow equipment flexibility

Timeline?

- Josie: DOE has sketched out on paper idea of how to make it happen by 2020 (likely would be a stretch; especially b/c would require legislative change in 2019)
- Bruce: suggests 3-4 EPWG members sit down w/ DOE to hash out a detailed timeline
- Josie: beneficial to show EPWG the problems that are happening on the ground? would that help propel things along?
- Carol: can we just remove pure VBM from the options? just focus on precinct based or hybrid instead?
- Johni: two things to address
 - not likely to get legislation passed by 2020
 - important to know options regarding software and hardware leasing
- Randy: wonders about legislative challenge—approach legislators and make it a priority. Pass in the first 60 days of 2019 by putting thumb on scale
- Eugene: public likes good spending, hasn't witnessed the crisis firsthand; instead concern lies w/ personnel—if there's a crisis now, why doesn't the public know about it?
- John Lindback: important to decide what kind of system AK wants before making a decision about what equipment to use; perhaps form small working group to make recommendation and lay proposal on the table about where AK should go w/ its elections—ultimate system recommendation should be made by EPWG as a group
- Marna: volunteering to go down and visit every legislator—should not overlook possibility of legislative change; crisis has been on the table since day 1 of this work group (push back on Eugene's concerns)
- Evan Anderson: MOA has invested in VBM equipment, potential option for state to also use that equipment?
 - Dennis: absolutely, would encourage state to look at partnering
- David: suggest as way of moving this along—seems like smaller group needs to form plan of action including strategy for legislative action (maybe Bruce could head that?)
 - Libby: subcommittee could look at changes to Title 15 too
- Indra: in addition to tech, cost, logistics, need to look at accessibility as important pillar
- Cindy: fan of hybrid system, would like to see greater breakdown on costs; helpful to have ballot ahead of time—helps w/ accessibility

- Roy: social importance of act of voting should be maintained—possible to have range of days or community day for community to rally around?
 - David: think we're all on the same page w/r/t importance of making any new system fit rural AK needs
- Libby: redistricting is coming soon (2021-22 for implementation)
 - Jeremy: pass asap to get under belts before redistricting

Following up on suggestions

- Bruce lead small group to form timeline and strategize legislative change; suggests inclusion of one city clerk (prefers two, one rural, one urban), Randy, DOE staff, maybe 1 or 2 others
 - Bruce, what can be provided here:
 - critical path (identifying what decisions need to be made and when)
 - may also outline suggestions
 - Timeline for small workgroup to resolve: end of June
 - Bruce: full working group should meet soon afterward
- Lt. Gov. wants to make sure all interested stakeholders are included in the EPWG
 - wants consensus and opportunity to be heard
 - part of Bruce subgroup's critical path
- Joyce Anderson: try to get feedback from voters that have used VBM in MOA?
 - Liz: scoop into smaller work group's work
- Josie: any effort to do follow up survey w/ MOA workers regarding what worked, what didn't? from voters' perspective?
 - Dennis: MOA is working on final report that will likely include kinds of Q&A that they had in the lead up to the election; could probably provide the kinds of questions that came in on election day (call logs)