

Steven Ward

From: Dwight Shellman
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2015 3:40 PM
To: Steven Ward
Cc: Edward Morgan
Subject: FW: Comments after the 12/11/15 PERC meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Friday, December 11, 2015 4:00 PM
Flag Status: Flagged

Please redact and post for the 12/17 PERC meeting.

From: Merlin Klotz [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2015 2:57 PM
To: Dwight Shellman [REDACTED]
Subject: Comments after the 12/11/15 PERC meeting

Please share appropriately:

Again, "Thank You" to the PERC committee for all the hard work that you have invested in considering, piloting and selecting an election system for the next twenty years for the state of Colorado.

I appreciated the discussions in the parts of this morning's meeting to the extent that I was able to listen. As a Hart legacy user and pilot county, I admit to having a bias as to my preferred vendor. That said I strongly agree with several pre-conclusion comments:

- A) That there is a case to be made for not pinning Colorado elections for the next 20 years on the financial viability of a single vendor... (remember Polaroid, Atari, Compaq, Braniff?)
- B) That Hart and Dominion appear to have decided advantages over the other two.

I disagree with the comparison of this selection to the State wide voter system as elections have many local nuances and demands while an accumulation system by its nature must be central and single thread.

There were two points that I made in my presentation that would repeat loudly in writing:

- All mail ballots have created a change on the back side of elections that cannot be ignored in this decision. In Douglas County in 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014 and 2015 elections, polling place ballot percent of total ballots cast were respectively, 61%, 32%, 22%, 22%, 4% and 1%.

Accordingly, Douglas County plans only to do central count going forward.

This is the critical distinction between Hart and the other vendors. Based on the Vendor presentations to the PERC, Hart alone produces an 8.5 inch wide ballot on their ADA or Ballot marking devices. Although all vendors rely on an 8.5 inch wide mail ballot, others produce an 8 inch wide ballot or use a 4+/- wide card in the polling place. As long as this difference exists, polling place Cast Vote images will be different from mail ballot images and when comparatively large numbers of styles exist can be matched to poll books violating voter privacy.

In the 2015 election Douglas had 805 polling place ballots cast between 197 precinct/styles or an average of only 4 ballots per style. Many of these could be matched to specific voter if the ballot widths/format on cast ballot images varied from mail ballots. In the 2014 primary with 145 precincts, only 26 Democrat voters voted in the polls and most could have been matched to poll books for identification had cast ballot images on poll ballots been different mail ballots.

- A vendor can instruct a group of programmers to write an on screen ballot resolution sub-system. That **does not** equate to a vendor who gained expertise in such a subsystem though 10 years of use and user feedback in

creating the latest version. I deeply disagree with assuming all on screen ballot resolution systems are created equal. It was doing ballot resolution since 2008 that set the stage for me Clerk today.

One further point not yet made.....

This week when I received several more requests for assistance with Special District elections, I realized that as a large county in the future we too will have need to scale for multiple smaller elections. I believe the equipment we piloted is very agile to meet this need.

Merlin Klotz, Douglas County Clerk and Recorder