SB11 Workgroup
Draft

Minutes

The meeting was called to order on October 13, 2015, 10:00AM by Co-Chair James Alcorn, State Board of Elections (SBE) Chairman and Co-Chair Matt Davis, Department of Elections (ELECT) CIO. Attending were SB11 Workgroup members Delegate Bill DeSteph, Deputy SOA Felix Sarfo-Kantanka, Jr., Al Ablowich, Jeremy Epstein, and Nancy Tickle. ELECT staff support members present were Terri Harman, Business Analyst and Rose Mansfield, ELECT Board Liaison.

The first order of business was the approval of the minutes from the SB11 Workgroup meeting on September 13, 2015. Chairman Alcorn asked if the members had any additions or corrections to the workgroup minutes. A typographical error was identified. Mr. Epstein moved *that the minutes be adopted as amended.* Mr. Davis seconded the motion and the members unanimously approved the minutes.

The first order of business was the workgroup report presented by Matt Davis, ELECT CIO. Mr. Davis stated that two documents: Considerations for Adopting Electronic Transmission of Marked Ballots and Compilation of Close Election Contests were provided for the members to review. In addition, The Absentee Ballot Application, Balloting and Voting Process workflow diagram was sent to members. Discussion among members on the issue of accessibility regarding voters whom SB11 was designed to support occurred and the application of SB11 as it relates to forward-deployed military members. Members discussed each of the *risks and controls* in the Considerations for Adopting Electronic Transmission of Marked Ballots and adjusted language to ensure appropriateness of each of the considerations. Members discussed security concerns of each of the *controls* and the level of *risks* associated to each application.

Mr. Epstein inquired about the recent Utah report and its similarity to the work of the SB11 workgroup. Mr. Davis stated that the workgroup members would receive the Utah report for review. Mr. Davis asked the members to consider the acceptable level of security risk to intended customers of the SB11 to provide the avenue to cast their ballots. Delegate DeSteph discussed that by voting electronically the customer would be absent support from an election official if they had issues while casting their ballot. Delegate DeSteph stated that the SB11 voter has two issues: (i) they do not have access to the United Postal Service and (ii) mailing from their physical location would compromise their mission. Delegate DeSteph stated that the element of risk was important and reminded members that SB11 voters currently do not have the opportunity to vote in these unique situations while serving their country. Mr. Davis noted that the system would need to indicate that the requestor was in protective status to maintain the secret location of the SB11 voter.

Mr. Davis stated that a centrally managed system would allow the electronic monitoring of requested SB11 voter absentee ballot requests. Ms. Tickle stated that

SB11 Workgroup

the management of this system has created concern, with the general registers, in that, the vote tabulation should occur at the local level. Mr. Davis stated that the central management would be for the request process and the tabulation would occur at the local level. Mr. Davis noted that the absentee ballot application requires a witness signature and the workgroup should consider a change to this procedure and consider how they would facilitate such a change. Mr. Davis stated that changes to the document reviewed would be sent to workgroup members after the updates and recommended changes were completed. Mr. Epstein asked if the program, once developed, would be tested outside from a source other than the developers. Mr. Davis inquired about the cost. Mr. Epstein stated that the cost is approximately between thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars per vulnerability which compared to the cost of building the system is trivial, as this is between one million to three million dollars. Mr. Davis asked if there were additional comments and concerns and there were none. Mr. Davis noted that the agenda items were group into one discussion topic. Mr. Davis stated that a secondary demonstration would be scheduled with Freewater Technologies at a future meeting.

Co-Chair Alcorn asked if there were any further comments and there were none. Co-Chair Alcorn moved *that the workgroup adjourn*. Co-Chair Davis seconded the motion and the workgroup unanimously approved the motion.

The next meeting of the SB11 Workgroup is set for November 16, 2015 at 10:00 AM at the Washington Building, 1100 Bank Street, Richmond, Virginia; Room B27.
There being no further business, the SB11 Workgroup adjourned at 10:10AM.

_____
Co-Chair James Alcorn

_____
Co-Chair Matt Davis

SB11 Workgroup