

**United States Election Assistance Commission
Clearinghouse
Roundtable Discussion**

1225 New York Avenue, NW

Suite 150

Washington, DC 20005

Tuesday, March 20, 2012

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

The following is the verbatim transcript of the United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Clearinghouse Roundtable Discussion held on Tuesday, March 20, 2012. The roundtable convened at 9:05 a.m., EDT and adjourned at 12:30 p.m., EDT.

UNITED STATES ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
CLEARINGHOUSE ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION

MR. ROBBINS:

Good morning everyone. And it is a good morning here in Washington, D.C. It's the first day of spring and all our cherry trees and magnolias are in full bloom. My name is Mark Robbins, and I'm General Counsel and Acting Executive Director of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission. I'm pleased to welcome old and new friends here today, both, with us in person, and via the webcast.

This is our inaugural 2012 roundtable discussions. And today, we're going to focus on the EAC's Clearinghouse functions, and the value that it brings to elections officials at the state and county level, and also the general public.

We anticipate a total of three roundtable discussions this year, during 2012, beginning with today's, and then, running through the beginning of the Presidential election season sometime around Labor Day. We found that these roundtable discussions are a useful and popular venue to raise and discuss relevant election issues, and they're particularly helpful to us under our present circumstances at the EAC, lacking a quorum of Commissioners. In fact, since December we've lacked any Commissioners at all.

But I want to assure friends and stakeholders and the elections officials around the country that despite these

circumstances the EAC remains open for business and meeting its statutory responsibilities. A few examples, our Office of Testing and Certification continues to work with our test laboratories on certifying new election systems, and in one case, working cooperatively with a manufacturer to address irregularities discovered in an existing system.

Our Grants Office continues to monitor outstanding grants programs mandated by Congress, and it continues to distribute previously appropriated HAVA requirements payments to states when the conditions are met.

Our Research, Policy, and Programs office continues work on completing HAVA-mandated studies and updating existing studies that will be ready for review upon the re-establishment of a quorum. And, in addition, they are currently working on the 2012 biannual Election Administration and Voting Survey.

And finally, as you're going to see this morning, our Communications and Clearinghouse Office continues to disseminate information of value to a variety of stakeholders.

As in past roundtables, we are pleased to welcome back our moderator and good friend, Professor Merle King. I'll introduce him, and then, let him introduce today's panel and the agenda. Professor King is an Associate Professor of Information Systems and the Executive Director for the Center for Election Systems at Kennesaw State University in Kennesaw, Georgia. He's an active researcher in election administration and the 2005 recipient of the National Association of Secretaries of State Medallion Award for his work in Georgia elections. Together with his colleagues at the

Center, Professor King has led the development of one of the nation's best resources for election administration support. The Center for Election Systems provides voting systems technical support to the Georgia Office of Secretary of State and to the 159 election supervisors countywide throughout the state. As a Professor of Information Systems, Professor King teaches graduate and undergraduate classes related to legal and leadership issues and information technology.

So again, welcome everybody. And Professor King, I hand this roundtable off to you.

DR. KING:

Thank you, Mark. Good morning everybody and welcome to this roundtable on the Clearinghouse function of the EAC. My job this morning will be simply to kind of go over the structure of the roundtable, the format, and then, we'll move right onto our program this morning.

A couple of things to keep in mind, there are several microphones on the table in front of you. The microphones are controlled from behind the screen, so you don't need to press any buttons. As soon as you speak, they'll come up -- the volume will come up in the room. The secondary microphones that you see are for the transcription service. And again, those are set and there shouldn't be any need to use the microphones.

We do invite you, though, to tweet during our roundtable. I know many of you are connected to your colleagues or to your own Twitter sites, and we encourage that throughout the day. And in fact, for those of you who are watching, we encourage you to both

tweet and use the EAC's website to send in questions or comments that you may have, to today's roundtable. And the website is www.eac.gov.

This morning, we're going to take kind of both a depth and a breadth approach to looking at the EAC Clearinghouse function. We're going to begin with looking at the HAVA mandate for the establishment of the Clearinghouse, how it was established, how it has matured, how its content is being used to impact elections throughout the country. And then, finally, what I believe will be the most important part of the roundtable, is the future of the Clearinghouse function, which is the ways in which the Clearinghouse can adapt itself to the needs and the growing demands of election officials across the country. So, we're going to kind of take historical through a future viewpoint of the roundtable.

For each of you at the roundtable today, I'll ask you to introduce yourselves, as you speak. I think that may be the most effective way to do it. I'll be asking that for the first portion that we take a break at 10:45. We need a hard break for the closed captioning folks to reload, and so, that will be really the only hard schedule in here. And I'll be queuing you. So, if it happens to be your turn to speak, no worries. I'll get you to a safe landing at that 10:45 mark.

At the very conclusion of the roundtable, I also want to assure you that each participant is given an opportunity to come back and reflect on what they heard and what they have thought to be the most important aspects of today's roundtable. And, it's an opportunity, as you reflect, not only on your own presentation, on

your colleague's presentation, but things that may have occurred through the morning to you. It will be an opportunity for you to have the last word. So today, as we finish up, there will be a chance to go around the table and let each member of the roundtable kind of summarize their takeaways for today's event. So, if you don't get a chance to get a comment in during the discussion portion, no worries, hold the comment, and there will be a chance at the very end.

With that then, I'm going to turn to the gentleman to my left, and if you're familiar with the EAC, this man is no stranger to any of us in the elections community, introduce Tom Wilkey.

MR. WILKEY:

Tom Wilkey, former Executive Director of the EAC, and I'm glad to be back home for a few minutes and good to see everybody. And I'm particularly grateful that EAC has decided to continue with these roundtables, because I think they have been extremely valuable to the election community as we'll probably hear today.

Do you want to introduce...

DR. KING:

Well, I think at this point, we'd like to go right into the presentations, and then, we'll ask each participant to introduce themselves prior to their speaking.

MR. WILKEY:

Okay.

DR. KING:

Thank you, Tom.

MR. WILKEY:

Well, as I indicated, I am particularly pleased that EAC has decided to continue to do these roundtables, because they have been most successful in the past. Since leaving EAC, I've been to a number of election meetings around the country, and it's, one of the things I hear most is, "Are they going to continue doing these kinds of things?" And my response has always been, "Yes, I think they will," and I think they'll be well received.

I think it's important that we start out today by going back ten years. This will be the tenth anniversary of the passage of the Help America Vote Act. And, as part of that Act, as you know, was the creation of the Election Assistance Commission, and there were various responsibilities that were given to EAC, as part of HAVA. And certainly, those will be discussed as a part of the Clearinghouse process today. Certainly, the biggest one, our Testing and Certification Division, is doing some excellent work in the area of voting system certification and voting system standards, the wonderful work that was done, and continues to be done, by our Research Division, and work that also has been done in the area of our grants programs and following up on the many grants that have been distributed throughout the country.

I think if we look back over those ten years, the first couple of years we wrung our hands, kind of thinking to ourselves, what's - - how are we going to get this Clearinghouse going? What's this Clearinghouse all about? We tried to come up, periodically, with a definition, "What is a Clearinghouse? Does anybody know what a Clearinghouse is?" We looked at other agencies and what they were doing in terms of a Clearinghouse. And a remarkable thing

happened. As our big programs began to mature, and to the state where there was an incredible amount of information, and I spoke just a few minutes -- seconds ago about our voting system certification program, the information that was generated by that program, and by our voting survey that we do every two years, and by our research projects that came about and began, as I said, to mature, we were literally putting a great amount of information up on our website. And what was it? It was a Clearinghouse. And it got bigger and better and stronger. One of the things that certainly made us all very proud was the fact that our website became one of the top five -- was named one of the top five in the Federal Government. That happened in a very short period of time, if you look at other federal agencies.

So, the Clearinghouse evolved simply because of the great work EAC was doing in its major areas of responsibility, and continues to grow today. Just last week I was at a meeting on the West Coast and listened to folks talk about the information that they've received, the very valuable information they receive looking at our Clearinghouse, looking at our website, keeping up with what's going on with our voting system certification progress, looking at, particularly, our voting system data, our voting data that we put out every two years, which has gotten better and better and better as we have moved forward.

And so, I think, as we'll see today in this discussion, that not only has EAC done an excellent job of putting together what we didn't know what would be a Clearinghouse, but ended up being a Clearinghouse, and ending up being exactly where Congress

wanted us to be. And I think we're going to see from some of the discussion today just how valuable this information is. So, I look forward to taking part in this discussion, and thank you and EAC staff for inviting me back to say hello.

Thank you.

DR. KING:

Thank you, Tom. I do think it is important to understand the evolutionary nature of the Clearinghouse, and the agency as a whole, as time goes forward, has continued to adapt. And so, that historical perspective, I think, in the early practices, that adapt and evolve, and adapt, it really set in place a precedent that has turned out to be very productive.

With that, I'd like to turn to Karen Lynn-Dyson, ask her to introduce herself, and go forward.

MS. LYNN-DYSON:

Good morning everyone, I'm Karen Lynn-Dyson and I'm Director of the Research, Policy and Programs Division at the EAC. I'm going to spend just a few minutes taking you through what some of the products are that our division is responsible for within the Clearinghouse. Keep in mind -- the audience should keep in mind that this does not include the voting system certification material that's on our website, my colleague Brian Hancock will talk about that later on in the morning, and also, our HAVA grants and those -- that program work is not included in this presentation.

I'm just going to just take a few minutes to very quickly take you through what some of these materials are. And the presenters have them on their table in front of them, but I think first and

foremost, our Election Administration and Voting Survey. Tom talked about this a little bit, and mentioned we've made enormous strides over the last seven, eight years and we're really, really proud of the data that's now available in the, what we call, EAVS. And I know Doug Chapin is going to talk a little bit about that. From a researcher's standpoint it is really now, I'm pleased to say, the gold standard, I think, of election data, and it just gets better and better.

These are an example of the four major reports that come out each year -- every other year, rather, from the Election Day Survey; our UOCAVA, NVRA reports, which are mandated by Congress. And this is an example, right here, of the kind of data that is included state by state, sometimes jurisdiction by jurisdiction, related to voting, elections and registration. We're pleased now to be able to do some cross year comparisons of data. And you can just see, and I think our researchers in the field see, it's getting better and better, and we really are going to, in short order, be able to do some longitudinal kinds of comparisons that will show, not only, the data improving, but what's really going in the field, in terms of voters, and elections overall.

We are -- I'm very pleased to say that over the last seven years, or so, we've done 22 research studies and reports. All of these are mentioned within HAVA and they are readily available on the EAC's website. And we continue to do what these HAVA mandated -- HAVA requires that we do and we're doing some work right now on administering elections in urban versus rural areas. And again, I just really encourage the audience to take a look at

this material that's on the website. And I know that around the government when issues come up around things like absentee voting, early voting, the use of postage, these reports are referred to and are considered valuable resources to those who are trying to better understand elections.

Within the Division of Research, Policy and Programs, under our policy function we deal with the National Voter Registration form and we administer assorted regulations related to that. I just want to give you a snapshot of what the NVRA and that state form looks like. We spent a lot of time actually handing this material out in various languages and doing those translations. A big part of our work, the Election Management Guidelines program. I'm very pleased to say that in the last half dozen years or so we've done 19 chapters on this -- within this program. And Tom was instrumental in the kickoff of this effort, and the thinking was, early on, that not only would we have these fully developed chapters but that we would also have, at the ready, Quick Starts for folks who were new to the field and needed to get a sense of quickly get up to speed on what was going on in the field. I understand these materials are used a great deal. I just wanted to give you a highlight here of what's included in the Quick Starts and in the bigger chapters; lots of tips, lots of examples, real-life examples.

And we also have a wonderful library resource of language assistance materials. We do -- in 11 different languages, we have materials that translate election terms. And I know Tammy, I think, is going to touch on that in her presentation, how they've actually

use this information, English to Spanish, Spanish to English, and with the other languages.

This past year, we did what I think is a great feature on the EAC's website. There's an interactive website feature in which, in real time, that local election official could type in a particular term, in one of the languages you see across the top of the screen, and they could instantaneously get a translation for that particular election term.

We also have our voters' guides, particularly proud of these, and I think local election officials may even have an opportunity to see these, because now, every new citizen in the United States is actually, through our Immigration and Naturalization Service, given one of these voters' guides. And it really is a resource for that new citizen, and voters overall, to get these very basic questions answered. Here's a sample within the voters guide, each state is listed, and their contact information.

We have -- one of the projects I'm most proud of is our effective designs project. It was a major undertaking we did about four or five years ago, and it has in it, for local election officials, an amazing repository of election signage that can be directly downloaded that meets your requirements, federal requirements. This particular slide is showing you all the design specs are there, so, I always like to tell folks that you, literally, just have to go to Kinko's, hand them this document, and you will have all of the signage that you need, or certainly, considered needed by the national requirements.

Finally, our very popular poll worker guidebooks. They exist for the general poll worker, recruitment training and retention. We also have one for college students. Just a sample here of the kinds of tips which, fully vetted with the field and drawn from best practices in the field, contain in there, lots of resources, again, in these guidebooks for students, recruiting students, for retaining poll workers, in general.

And then, ending with a slide we've recently created that I think is a neat overview of where over the course of half a dozen years or so we have had grant programs in our college poll worker grant effort. So, I'd like to point out to the field that this is, and maybe in your own state, is a place where colleges have paired with local election jurisdictions to recruit and train college students to serve as poll workers.

So, that gives you a slapdash overview of all of the material that my division has responsibility for and continues to distribute broadly, widely, and always looking for feedback. And when Merle circles back around to the end of the presentation, I'll talk a little bit about what some future vision might be for using these materials and adding to them.

DR. KING:

Good, thank you Karen. I have one question before we move on. For the folks that are watching today and have seen the tremendous collection of materials, I know, many of them -- in fact our friends in Illinois, I think, have an election today, good luck to them -- but many of the folks that are watching are prepping for either primaries, or even looking forward to the general. How can

they go about getting the materials that are on the website, ordering the Quick Start Guides, et cetera?

MS. LYNN-DYSON:

Oh, I absolutely ask that everybody feel very free to contact me directly. We have, within our division, a program support specialist. I'm Karen Lynn-Dyson and my information is klynn-dyson@eac.gov. Our support specialist, Marci Reedy, is the person who will get you everything, and all the material you could possibly want or need, all of these resources, hardcopies, should you like them. And please, by all means, be in touch with us. My telephone number 202-566-3123.

DR. KING:

Okay good, thank you. Before we move on, then, to our panel discussions, first, I thank Tom and Karen for the overview of the origins of the Clearinghouse, and kind of a 10,000 foot flyover, of the contents of the Clearinghouse. I think for many of us who utilize these resources frequently, we have a tendency to tunnel down into that part of the resource that fits our particular need, and it's only at times like this where I really see the breadth of the material that's available. And it's very, very impressive.

The purpose of our panel today is to demonstrate the impact that these materials have had down to the jurisdiction level, whether that's at the state, or the county, or the municipality, but to demonstrate the different ways in which election officials, and researchers, testing organizations, have utilized these materials to have an impact.

And our first speaker is Doug Chapin. And again, the model that we used before, I'll ask Doug to introduce himself, and then talk about how his organization or he, as an individual, has used these materials. Doug?

MR. CHAPIN:

Thank you, Merle. Thank you to the EAC for the invitation to be here with you all today. My name is Doug Chapin. I am currently Director of the Program for Excellence and Election Administration at the University of Minnesota's Humphrey School of Public Affairs. And the program is really designed to do what the name implies, which is to identify opportunities to bring excellence to the field of election administration. We say our mission is to bring 21st Century methods to the development of a 21st Century profession of election administration. And, really, if you have followed any of the work that we've done, and I am online with a blog, which I will happily tweet out shortly, you know that data is a very important part of that process.

I really think that data is valuable to the field in three basic ways. Number one, thanks to Karen's excellent presentation -- if that's slapdash, I'd like you to come slapdash paint my house -- but you see what a tremendous resource data can be for the field, whether it's in translating ballot materials or understanding what sort of signage to build or where to go for assistance in developing college poll worker programs. It's a tremendous resource for the field.

Second of all, it's a community building exercise. I often joke with international visitors, that contrary to popular belief, the United

States does have a uniform election system, and that's that everybody does it their own way, and can't believe it that anyone would do it any differently. And collecting the data is an opportunity for different jurisdictions to see how their similarities might help them to share information and ideas across the profession.

And then, finally, I think data is the alphabet of a common language in the new profession of election administration. Any profession, whether it's law, or medicine, or accountancy, or what have you, has a common language, a common approach, a common set of beliefs. And the kind of data that the EAC and others are collecting is the alphabet of a common language that we can use to talk to one another about what are the current problems, what are the current opportunities, what are the kinds of solutions that we can put in place to make the job we do better, and also make it work for our citizens, not just as voters, but as taxpayers.

So, looking at how -- what role the EAC's Clearinghouse has played in my work and other work that I've done, in many ways, the fact that the EAC is out there collecting data from states and localities about election administration, I know we're focusing mostly on the Clearinghouse, but I think including the testing and certification work that's done, including the other work that the agency does, the agency really is, in many ways, the go-to for important data in the field. I know that there is a challenge, under the Help America Vote Act, in that the agency is required to collect much of this data, but states and localities aren't necessarily required to provide it, but still, the data that we get through the Election Administration and Voting Survey, that we get through the

other work, even where it's incomplete, is incredibly valuable, and I think shows us the way forward to better data collection in the field.

I would encourage those of you out there listening and those of you here in the room who obviously care passionately enough about this to be here on a beautiful spring morning in Washington, D.C. to look for opportunities, not just to encourage people to put the data that's already required into the system, but to look for opportunities to collect new data. We recently -- I profiled a story out of St. Charles County Missouri, where the county executive vetoed a voting equipment purchase, because only one vendor had bid on the contract. Now, the circumstances were, essentially, that only one vendor could bid on the contract, given the current state of the industry and certification. But, the executive's rationale for the veto was that he had no way of being sure that the bid that was being presented was a fair bid for the taxpayers of St. Charles. And so, I would encourage members of the community and the agency to find a way to build in, not just participation numbers, not just testing and certification numbers, but some way to build in some monetary data, so that St. Charles County could compare itself to a comparable county, whether it's Maricopa or Kansas City or another jurisdiction across the country, and if not know for sure whether or not it's the best bid for St. Charles County, at least whether it compares fairly, going forward. That's the kind of opportunity we have for data to serve in a common language.

Having said that, the data that the EAC already collects and makes available is an incredible value, and I know there are many people out there, including my former colleagues at the PEW

Center on the States election team, who rely very heavily on a lot of the EAC data, especially the Election Administration and Voting Survey, as a way to look at the future and current performance of the election system.

I look forward to the discussion about what we can do, if not to force jurisdictions to make data available, to make it worth their while to do so, whether it's serving a common language, whether it's building the community, or whether it's, essentially, helping themselves with resources they'll need in our very diverse, but still incredibly well functioning election administration system.

So, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I can't wait to hear what the real experts on the panel have to say, and look forward to being a part of the discussion. Thank you.

DR. KING:

Thank you, Doug. I wanted to follow-up with a quick question on a comment you made, which I think may be more profound than probably not that you intended, but maybe to the listeners, and that is the importance of election officials understanding what goes on beyond their jurisdiction, and how we all exist in a web, now, of elections, and what happens in Maricopa County, or West Virginia, or anywhere else, does impact us all.

You mentioned that a part of the lexicon that the EAC has built becomes the alphabet, becomes the common language for the professionalism of election officials. There are many criteria that are often used when we talk about a profession; a code of ethics, peer review, commitment to professional development, but certainly, one criteria for any profession is that there's a common

body of knowledge, and that I think there's been awareness in, certainly the past ten years, that the body of knowledge in elections has to extend beyond your jurisdiction's laws as you evolve towards that.

Could you comment on your perception of this EAC repository as a component of that body of knowledge?

MR. CHAPIN:

Absolutely, and I think that's -- that was absolutely as profound as I meant to be. So, thank you for noticing that.

[Laughter]

MR. CHAPIN:

I do think that a common body of knowledge, a common standard is important. A long time ago one of the major television networks said of its summer reruns that, "If you've never seen it before, it's new to you." And I think sometimes elections officials get that within their own jurisdictions. We saw that in St. Charles County. We saw it recently with jurisdictions who are now subject to Section 203 and the minority language requirements of the Voting Rights Act. When it happens to you, as an election official in a jurisdiction, it can feel like it's brand new. And we always tend to magnify the impact of our own challenges. But the kind of data that the EAC makes available, the expertise of the people, the other people we've got sitting around the table here today, is a tremendous resource. And while a new language, a new voting system, a new law might be new to you in your jurisdiction, it is almost a certainty that it is not new to someone else. And while it may be impossible to pick up the phone, or type on a keyboard and be in contact with

those people in each jurisdiction, the odds are that they've put some of that information into the Clearinghouse, or at least their contact information, so that you know where to find them. So, having a common body of knowledge, almost like a library at Alexandria, if you will, for the profession where people can at least start to find the answers to their problems, is a really valuable service of something like this.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you Doug. Tammy?

MS. PATRICK:

Good morning, I'm Tammy Patrick. I'm the Federal Compliance Officer for Maricopa County in Arizona, which is the Phoenix metropolitan valley. And thank you so much for having me today. It's an honor to be here.

I'm going to start off riffing off of Doug here. If data is the common language that we're using in elections, I think we all have a secret handshake. And our secret handshake is, we have almost two million registered voters. We have -- more than half of our voters vote by mail. We have a blended system of optical scan and DRE at the polling place and we're covered under Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act for Spanish, and also the Tohono O'odham language and then we are also under Section 5.

So, with that, you instantly know where I'm coming from, for the most part. What I wanted to do is just touch briefly on sort of four of the different functions of the Clearinghouse that we've used in Maricopa County and that would be the EMG, the Election Management Guidelines, the Quick Start Guides, the minority

language materials, and then also, Election Day Survey datasets, and UOCAVA studies and research.

When it comes to the Election Management Guidelines and the Quick Start Guides, one of the things I think is very important, and we talked about this briefly a moment ago, is that in elections we have a lot of turnover. With an election you can have a newly elected official, newly appointed positions. So, you can always have this new influx of new blood. You can have new coverage under the Voting Rights Act. Also, we have some things that happen that don't happen very frequently, like a recount. Luckily, in Maricopa County, we don't have recounts very often, so it's very helpful to be able to go to a Quick Start Guide, reorient ourselves, and just kind of come up with, okay, this is the basis of what we have to remember as we move forward. And sometimes it seems like it's intuitive that you would remember everything, but it's good to have a backup, when you don't.

For the minority language materials, we've been using the glossaries, the English to Spanish and Spanish to English glossaries, for a number of years at our poll worker training. And I'm flipping through here because I am PowerPoint dependent. I should make that announcement right off the bat, so I do have a PowerPoint that will be on the website that includes some pictures from our poll worker training, including some of the slides from bilingual class. And one of the things that we did in Maricopa County is we have a local glossary of the local vernacular, but we also provide the EAC glossary, which the poll workers love. And some would say, "Well, why do you do that? That's overkill. Aren't

they the same”? And they’re not the same. One of the reasons why we did it is because we have a lot of people who move to Arizona because of our nice weather there. It’s not so bad here today, but a lot of people move to Arizona because of the weather, so there’s a difference in the use of the language. The best example that I have is, in our local glossary, when it comes to the word “ballot”, which seems very simple, very basic, our local glossary what people say in Arizona is boleta, whereas in the EAC glossary it’s papeleta. Our poll workers, the first time I point that out to them, are incredulous. They would never think to use that word, but if they’re talking to someone who just moved there from another community it’s very helpful for them as an additional resource.

One of the other things that we’ve been using, and I’m so happy to hear that the Naturalization ceremonies will be giving these out, I won’t need to get any more in this case, every Friday in Arizona, in downtown Phoenix at the Justice O’Connor Federal Courthouse, we have our Naturalization ceremonies, usually one or two a week, and we naturalize between a hundred and 300 people every week. So, we go and conduct voter outreach and we’ve been handing out the Voters’ Guides to Federal Elections. And the new Americans really appreciate it, because the first time they go in to cast a ballot as an American citizen it’s very exciting, but it’s also a little intimidating, a little frightening. So, it’s good for them to have an overview, and I think it makes them better voters.

One of the other functions that we’ve been using from the Clearinghouse is, I’ve been participating in the Election Center’s

benchmarking taskforce. We've been utilizing the dataset to look at what is being collected by local election officials in the states, and how we can use that moving forward in performance management. Now, part of what we've found is that we really migrated towards the EAC dataset because, one, it's free and, of course, none of us have money for purchasing data. It's multi-year, it's readily available. But one of the things we've found is that not all of our colleagues have been collecting data at the same level, and, of course, there's the commonality of language. What's being referred to as how many ballots are being sent out, do you really want to know exactly how many ballots or how many voters were mailed a ballot, and how many of those voters returned their ballot, not necessarily did they get one ballot, two ballots. And, as the survey changed over the years, the numbering of the actual questions, of course, changed, as it changed in the number of questions being asked, and so, following the same question, multi-year was a little bit of a challenge. And again, we're election officials, not political scientists, so it's been a little bit of a challenge there. But I think it's really important for the information to be out there so that, one, you can measure yourself and the public can kind of measure how you're doing against yourself as a performance measure, but also for the comparison from one jurisdiction to the next.

And lastly, then, the last function that we've kind of relied upon heavily in Maricopa County would be the UOCAVA studies and research that have been done by the EAC. I'm very fortunate that my County Recorder Helen Purcell has been on the TGDC

since its beginning and has played a very active role in some of the movement within the Voluntary Voting System Guidelines, and kind of moving some of our services forward for that voting population. And we've taken some of the research that the EAC has done, and internalized it and done some of our own review, and that review has, therefore, fed back into the online demonstration project, how best to manage the population. So, I see it really as a very symbiotic relationship, in that the local election officials provide the information to the states, the states provide it to the EAC, but then, we get materials and information back that we can use to hopefully better improve our processes.

DR. KING:

Thank you, Tammy. I'm very intrigued with your observation that the recipients of the materials coming from the Clearinghouse seem to be growing, and the comment about new citizens being recipients of voting guides, excellent application, but you also mentioned the recount procedures, and often I think what we find challenging is explaining recount, not to the staffs of election offices, but explaining it to candidates and parties. And so, I'm thinking there's another constituency that might benefit from these materials.

But I wanted to follow up with your observation about the importance in any quality assurance program, in any organization that is trying to improve its performance, that the collection of metrics is critical. If you cannot measure what you're doing, it's hard to plot a way to improve the performance of that process. So, if you could, just briefly touch again on how Maricopa is utilizing the

data that's either collected by the EAC or refined from the EAC, as a part of its internal QA process.

MS. PATRICK:

I think one of the best examples would be that we utilize data on a number of levels. I'm kind of a data geek, I have to admit that, as well as the PowerPoint thing. But – so, we've used it in terms of looking at pending legislation and how legislation would affect our voters in our county. Most recently we had legislation going through that had to do with moving all of our elections to every two years only, in August and November. So, we looked back at some of the data we had collected for voter roll off, or voter fatigue, from the top of the ticket to the bottom of the ticket, and then compared that to some of our minority language participation precincts to see if there was any sort of retrogressive effect. We've used it in litigation as far as information regarding our DREs, how many reports had come in about malfunctions when a voter was there at the polling place. And we were able to have a lawsuit that was actually dropped, because we could demonstrate, not anecdotally, but with hard facts that we were not getting calls into our offices via our reporting system, that there was an issue with our voting equipment.

We utilize it in so many different ways, it's hard for me to even think about not being able to turn to the data, because when you're in an election cycle on Election Day the phones are ringing, everything gets crazy, and you might have one polling place calling you five or six times, and suddenly, you think you have this major problem, because you hear this being bounced around the room,

when in fact, it's just one isolated incident that the person just keeps calling in repeatedly about. So, I think by being able to look back at the data and use it to judge whether or not you really have an issue, and if you have an issue, you would want to know about it, so that you can address it.

In our 2010 election, we had a huge drop off in the return of our early ballots. We normally see about 90 to 95 percent of the ballots returned. With our permanent early voting list, in the 2010 election, it dropped to 77 percent. And what we found was that by looking at the source codes of the permanent early voting requests of those voters, many of them had made the request online when they were updating their voter registration. So, what we found was that -- it will be interesting to see in the next election. I think that those voters are going to participate by mail. But what we're finding is that by tracking, and, at least capturing the data, whether you're using it instantly or not, is really the key. And sometimes we have the data that maybe we haven't thought to look at it in a new way, that allows us to kind of do some assessments that maybe we hadn't thought of in the past.

DR. KING:

That's excellent. When we get to the end of our program today and we're talking about future directions, and as you've pointed out, that there is a cycle here, where materials can start at the EAC, get cycled back through, and now, lifting them back up into the EAC, that the data that you described that is used to inform the legislative process or to prepare for litigation, the data may not be that relevant to other jurisdictions, but the method by which you

collected the data and presented the data is probably reproducible and sharable in every jurisdiction. So, we're going to come back and we're going to touch on that towards the end, excellent.

Jackie Harris.

MS. HARRIS:

Good morning. First, I'd like to thank the EAC again for having me be part of the roundtable today. I'm really excited to be here and I'm already getting bullet points that I'm writing down for future use.

I've been in elections now, I hate to admit it, but for 22 years. And during that time I've been an election's administrator in a somewhat rural jurisdiction, in a large urban jurisdiction, and I currently serve as the Policy Director to the West Virginia Secretary of State's Office. And in that capacity, my primary function is to work on legislative development and advocacy, and certainly, that's where I use many of the materials today. But from my past, you know, as I've moved forward through the years, prior to the EAC being around, and so much data being available to us, it was very difficult to look outside state borders, as was mentioned earlier, and try to get a broader perspective of what was going on in the elections administration industry. And there wasn't a really good place to turn for this type of material. And as the EAC has started to develop these materials and make them available, we certainly use them, again, for new election workers.

And, you know, we've spoken about a common language, but there's more than just a common language that needs to be learned in elections. It's the whole concept. There's all these conceptual issues like transparency and timeline development,

chain of custody, these types of procedural things that are really broad concepts that apply across the election spectrum that need to be taught quickly to someone coming into the industry. And typically what we find, that people enter this industry with very little experience in elections. And though there are new programs out there, there's not really a clear path of education that leads you to become an election administrator. So, you have to kind of pick it up on the fly. Oftentimes, you're coming into the office and, you know, eight weeks from now there's an election and there are all these rules and regulations and you need to do it right. So, I find that the Quick Start Management Guides are a great way to immediately expose someone, not only to the language, but to these concepts. And that's very important.

But from the state perspective, what I'm doing now, what I find is the Clearinghouse gives me really valuable research tools. When I'm developing legislation, the first thing I do is immediately jump out and say, you know, "What's Tammy doing?" I always look there. And what are other states doing? Where does West Virginia fall in the spectrum, you know? I can start to look at data points, and before, you know, I'd be picking up phone calls, and I might call people that I know, or states that I think might be similar to ours. But you can only, as an individual, collect so many data points, and you might get a wide array of responses in that, and really trying to place yourselves, you know, on a continuum, and say, "Where does our state fall in this," is difficult. But when I can pull up, you know, I often pull up the little charts that are available, and I can start to see, okay, West Virginia falls here, you know. Are we above? Are

we below? Can I start to do trend spotting? And can I say, "Oh well look, you now, how this state is doing," or maybe they have a best practice in place, and I may kind of pinpoint where I'm going to go for additional information based on these statistical sets. And it really helps me to move forward.

Also, when I'm speaking to the Legislature and I'm trying to define or describe to them why we are introducing legislation out of the Secretary of State's Office, they want to have hard facts and they want to know what the credentials are of the sources of those facts. So, when I can come to them and say, "Here's an EAC survey," or this is -- you know this is documentation that they will accept as being valid. And I need to have that as part of that advocacy process.

And I can only kind of echo and emphasize what's been said earlier about being able to look outside of your own borders, because it's so important to every election administrator, and it's really easy to become very myopic and to look at the own problems that are internal. But we find that I'm oftentimes following legislation and litigation in other states. So, as other states are passing laws, like this year, every one with the voter ID laws that are coming forth, you know, we're looking at how that legislation has been written, what are the impacts, what are the pros and cons that are being put forth, so that we can respond to it effectively, if it comes up in our state. And certainly, with litigation, we followed an Arizona case that had to do with public financing. It was very important to our state, an Ohio case about equal protection, you

know, very important to our state, so being able to follow those types of things.

And, what the EAC has done is created somewhat of a monster, because you do have this huge array of information and we've now created this voracious appetite for even more information. So, as part of the development, when we get around to discussing, you know, where to go in the future, we just have this list of things we would love to be able to access, because there are so many emerging issues in the industry. And, as we know, emerging issues oftentimes result in quickly crafted federal legislation, which has this global impact, and fairly immediate impact. And because these issues, you know, kind of just rise to the top quickly, we want to be able to track them just as quickly. And so, as we move forward, that's what we're looking for from the EAC.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you. You mentioned something I like to think about as the "hot stove" that I don't have to touch it, if another state has touched it to find out if it's hot. And I think using the EAC Clearinghouse as one of our tools for looking at trends, looking at experiences in other states.

But you introduced something that's, in some ways, related to Doug's observations earlier about the role of the EAC in transforming the culture of elections, the values that we hold as election officials. If you could come back and just kind of touch on the ways in which you think the culture of elections have been

changed in the last ten years, and what the role of this repository of EAC materials may be in that.

MS. HARRIS:

Absolutely, what I think has really happened in the elections industry is that 20 years ago we were quiet little offices that kind of operated in a void. We were the nice people at the end of the hall who oftentimes, you know, gave directions to people, "Oh, this is where you get your marriage license." Or, you know, we became kind of the catchall of information. But that's not the case anymore. We are under a lot of scrutiny, all of us. And places that are just now moving into that level of scrutiny, which is the case in West Virginia, it's been kind of a sleepy, quiet place as elections go, but as we see more federal oversight, more advocacy groups, the political parties are becoming more astute, voters are much more informed, and suddenly, everyone is kind of looking much more closely at every detail of the electoral process. And people need to be on the ball. They need to make sure they have these elements available. And that's a huge shift in the overall culture. So, it's essential that an election administrator understand how to inventory properly, how to -- document retention, transparency, this chain of custody, this division of authority, all these types of conceptual issues that may have been just kind of done in, I'm not going to say overly casual, but just in the small office manner of, "Well, Susie takes care of this and Jan takes care of that," and, you know, this is how it's been done from day to day, and now, you need to realize that everything needs to be more structured, and you need to be able to have the documentation in place. It's now a high-tech

industry with a lot of high-tech observation, and there's a lot of people that need to move from the '50s into the 2010s.

DR. KING:

Well, thank you for those observations. I'd also add that one of the phenomena that occurs in the transition of election administration at the jurisdiction level is it's often unplanned. And, in fact, there is no transition plan between administration, say at the local level and sometimes the state level. And the EAC's repository can help bridge that cultural gap. And I think what we often see is when there is changeover in the offices is when there is heavy utilization of how do I come up to speed on these kind of cultural, value issues associated with elections. Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Barbara Dunmore. Barbara?

MS. DUNMORE:

Good morning. And again, like my colleagues I'd like to thank the EAC for letting me be here today and share some of my observations and experience.

A little less than a year ago I was appointed as the Assistant Registrar of Voters for Eldorado County California. It's a rural county in the northern part of the state, encompassing about 1,700 square miles with two incorporated cities. To give you an idea, it's the -- an area in the Gold Rush. It's -- we have Placerville and South Lake Tahoe are two incorporated cities, and the rest of our residents live in the unincorporated areas primarily formed into community services districts. We have approximately 180,000 residents in our county, and about 105,000 registered voters at this time. Prior to my employment with, being appointed the Assistant

Registrar of Voters in Eldorado, I served in a Southern California urban county for six years as an election official covering 7,200 square miles with over two million in population, 26 incorporated cities, and upwards of 850,000 registered voters.

So, I hope today to share with you a contrast in my two services in the election field. I must admit that when I was asked to participate in this panel today and comment on the Clearinghouse, I was a bit overwhelmed, because the Clearinghouse has become such a daily part of what we use in the elections field. So, I perused the site and tried to focus my attention, and what I'm going to do today is talk about the election management resources portion of that. But I did notice on the website, which, you know, in the fast-paced world of elections you can overlook, is that there is a feedback button. And I encourage all my colleagues or people who visit the site to leave feedback. It's something that I've been remiss in doing, and so, I'm happy to be invited here today to do that.

First, I'd like to compliment the EAC on how their information comes together. My colleague Tammy Patrick and I, several years ago, were able to participate in development of one of the Quick Start Guides, along with some of our other election officials around the country. And we came together and we discussed the topic, we talked about the challenges and successes that we have had, what checklist, what you need to look for. And the EAC then took that information and assembled it into one of the Quick Start Guides that's comprehensive, practical, and timely.

In addition to the Quick Start Guides, of course, there are the Election Management Guidelines, which have already been

covered somewhat, but I'd like to share, in my experience in a large county, how the materials from the Clearinghouse are used. In a large county it's typically the managers at the top level, the executive managers, who access the website, who go there and grab information, you know, digest it, and then come about looking at other jurisdictions with policies that may fit your own jurisdiction. Those are then given to the mid level managers, who then write the policies -- the procedures, excuse me, for implementing those policies and then it goes down to what we call our line staff, or our specialists who implement those procedures.

In contrast, in the small county that I'm in now, it's more of a very intimate setting. It's, of course, a smaller county, you have smaller staff, and basically, everyone operates as a mid manager. You have to be intimately involved with every aspect of the election in order to make it successful. So, there's all kinds of cross training and, you know, and participation. And so, what I find is that the information is more prevalent in the office and on the minds of our staff, because we have to all use it and access it. And, of course, with a small county also comes not only a smaller staff, but smaller budgets. And so, what we find is that many times we can't do the training of our employees. We can't send them to training. So, what we do is we use the Clearinghouse, we use the Quick Start Guides, we use the webcast, or the informational videos that are on there in order to provide such training and education of our staff, so that we can fill that void for our staff.

In Eldorado County, we are currently heading up a 13-county consortium sponsored by a \$1.8 federal voting assistance program

grant. And as we've been putting this together and looking at our data reporting for that grant, we have accessed the Clearinghouse to review what we're already reporting and how we can, basically, you know, kill two birds with one stone, and make that a consistent reporting, so that what we report to the FAC is consistent with what goes to the EAC. In this consortium also what we've found is that not all of us have been doing things the same. So, as we try and move forward we're looking for consistency across counties, so that we're all performing it in the same manner, and one of the resources that we went to have been the Clearinghouse to get guidance on how to formulate such consistency.

As I think about moving forward in the Clearinghouse, and I know Merle that we're going to get to this a little bit later, what comes to my mind is that there are so many new emerging technologies that we've been experiencing, especially in California. Not emerging technologies, using technology that's available to everyone differently in elections, incorporating it into elections. Sure we had the era of the electronic voting units and those units were exclusive to our field, but now we have iPads and iPhones and smart phones. In California, we've seen the smart phone used as a tool for gathering petition signatures. We've seen the iPad, in Oregon, used to assist shut-ins and disabled voters to cast their votes. And we've seen online ballot marking wizards where UOCAVA voters can mark their ballot online and print it out and send it back. And so, those are some of the areas that I'll be looking to see if the Clearinghouse can help us refine and address as we move forward.

DR. KING:

Thank you, Barbara. I wanted to follow up on something, and I think your characterization of your county as being a small county is an excellent one. And, as you know, there are many much smaller counties. There are half person offices that are around the country.

One of the effects of having a small staff is that you have fewer specialists, and, therefore, everyone must become a generalist. And to that end, the materials that you've used from the EAC, how well have they fit your organization's needs, in terms of the assumptions of the reader, of the user, the level of detail, the readability, the overall usability for a small county that doesn't have a training specialist to integrate those materials in and reprocess them? Could you talk about how the match has been between the materials and your staff?

MS. DUNMORE:

Certainly, the match between the materials and the staff, I definitely think that the materials have been written for the audience, which is election officials. It always serves as, not the answer, but the groundwork for us to start working from. One of the nice features of the EAC's work is that it's broad, and so, what you do is you take from it, you know, what fits your jurisdiction, or your state's laws, and that's where you start with your groundwork and move forward.

DR. KING:

Thank you. And I also wanted to just reinforce your observation that the modern election official really is an IT manager. Whether they want to be, whether they were trained to be, it's the reality of our profession, right now. Thank you so much.

Our next speaker is Steve Moreno from Colorado.

MR. MORENO:

Good morning everyone. I'd also like to extend a thank you to the EAC for the invitation to sit with such a distinguished group of election officials. And my name again is Steve Moreno. I'm the Weld County Clerk and Recorder. I'm from Northern Colorado.

I've had a very interesting journey to the current position I hold right now. I grew up in Southeastern Colorado in La Junta, Colorado. It was an opportunity that I had before leaving the area to work for the Otero County Clerk and Recorder. The reason I mention this is the early '80s the county was using the old lever machine. Many of us remember that machine where you pull the rod across and shut the curtain. But I was also helping the staff and the clerk do the logic and accuracy testing on the machines. I remember thinking back now on the time that we were using that type of equipment, it was basically run on the honor system, as I think Jackie was alluding to earlier. I worked there for a little under two years, and then I moved to Northern Colorado in July of 1985 and began another journey working for the Weld County Clerk and Recorder. And I was not hired specifically for the election department, but did have the opportunity to help with the elections. Again, this was in the '80s, and we were using the punch card machines, probably more famously known for the hanging chad that was made. But the procedures there were a little bit more constrained to making sure the process was done correctly. And I can remember the testing that we would do from the warehouse to the packaging of supplies to the precincts and observing the

process of training election judges, obviously, I was not the person in charge, but I was just part of the staff to help them in this process.

But then as my journey continued, in January of 1995, a new Clerk and Recorder was elected, and the new Clerk and Recorder asked if I'd consider serving as her Chief Deputy Clerk and Recorder. Given this opportunity, I was given more responsibility on working with the election department. And the reason I mention this is at that time the life of the voting equipment was coming to an end. We had used the system, the punch card voting machines for over 15 years, and the county started to research to see what would be best for the implementation of tabulation for the voting equipment. The equipment that we chose was the OS units, optical scan units, where you take the ballots and you can process these right at the precincts and have them tabulated a lot sooner. Again, I had more to do with the process then. I would help with the testing of the machines and the packaging of supplies, and also, with the training, at this point in my journey as working there in the Clerk and Recorder's Office.

And then, in November of 2002 the voters of the county had decided that they wanted to elect me, and I put my hat forward into the arena. And I know many of you are probably looking at me like, "What were you thinking?" Because, as we all know, in October of 2002, President Bush signed the HAVA law, Help America Vote Act, and this is where we're at today with the EAC with the Clearinghouse and the information that they're gathering. I

continued with this journey, and in 2006 and 2010, I was reelected, and I've just continued with this process.

But, as I have moved forward with the responsibility as a chief election official for the county that I represent, the time came where -- with the HAVA law, that we had to make the accessibility voting machines available to our voters. And one of the things that I needed to do was to gather as much research, and one of the things reaching out with what the EAC has put together from the Clearinghouse, knowing that you need to partner up with the shareholders of the process of who will be using the machines, not only those that will be using the machines, but the legislators that will be passing legislation on what they feel how we will conduct our elections, and the Board of County Commissioners for instance, and the fiscal responsibility of the dollars that we spend for the taxpayers. So, I've had just an interesting journey through this whole process, to see what's happened through the election world from lever machines, punch card, optical scan, to the accessibility voting machines. And when we finally came down to a decision point of what would be best for our county, we went with all DREs., the direct recording electronic voting machines for our voters.

But as we all know, evolutions in elections can quickly change, and in Colorado where I come from, we have seen the evolution to where the counties are more seeing the mail ballot process continue. And one of the things that the Clearinghouse has put together is just a number of things that they've gathered from jurisdictions that have handled this process, such as the State of Oregon and Washington, and what lessons have been learned in

how we can build upon our processes to make sure that things are handled fairly and accurately and securely in the process.

I think about many of these things that have been stated by my colleagues that have been speaking. Looking at some of the Quick Starts for myself as the chief election official dealing with the media and public relations of what's important and making sure things are in place, the contingency plans of the process in elections, and what we need to do to make sure that we are not only thinking for the process of the election, but what happens if the systems start to fail. For instance, when I think about the points that have been made through some of the gathering of the Clearinghouse, it's -- it gives the thought process, not only for myself but the staff and you think about the smaller counties that face -- everyone faces the same thought process of what do we do should things not go as planned.

So, that's just kind of my thoughts and perspective of what I've seen from the EAC, what they have to offer. And I just thank you for the invitation and look forward to the lively discussion of how this will continue to help, not only one county, but we all know that isn't one-size-fits- all, but get our thoughts going, and what we can do to make sure we're doing things right in our own jurisdictions.

DR. KING:

All right. Steve mentioned something that hasn't been brought up yet this morning about the Clearinghouse. We've talked about its data and the importance of jurisdictions when they take that data to make sure they kind of fold it into their processes to look at it.

You've introduced the idea that the processes themselves are there at the Clearinghouse, and you mentioned when you were trying to look at assessing accessibility needs within your acquisition of your voting system. Could you talk about that a little bit about how you looked at what was there in the Clearinghouse and how you kind of modified that process to fit the needs of Weld County?

MR. MORENO:

Well absolutely, one of the things that, again, as I said, the voters would not be the only ones that would be viewing the equipment that would be used. You're going to have the special interest of those that have a lot of knowledge. When you're talking about the new generation of voting equipment, for instance, the experts in the field of the electronics, there's concern about the security to the process. Are these machines fully secured in the process and that you bring in the shareholders and invite them to keep the openness. I think I heard from Jackie or others about the transparency to the whole process. You have these mock set-ups of an election, and place these in your jurisdictions to give people an opportunity prior to ever purchasing the equipment to get their feedback of what they may see as not being a full-proof plan in the use of the machines.

I can remember sitting down with some of the computer folks within my jurisdiction, or even outside the jurisdiction, that came to some of the demonstrations that we had with our voting equipment, that was pointed out in Quick Start books of making sure you get the shareholders included in the process here, to get that feedback,

so you can answer these questions before they become a problem through the explanation of what is in place from the chain of custody through the whole process of using the new generation of equipment. Obviously, any time you introduce something new there's going to be questions of the security. And the folks that are -- that I brought in just really helped me from what I -- the importance of not only the skeptics, but also, the folks that -- the reasons we were putting these machines out there, the ADA machines, the accessibility, bringing in the folks from the accessibility groups, going to their centers, or bringing them in to ask for some of their input of what we can do to implement this, was this the right type of machine.

I can remember one example, in my county, that we had a demonstration. Off to the side, I had a staff member visiting with a handicapped voter that was in the wheelchair, that was using the sip-n-puff, and we were trying to figure out, will this accessibility machine work for a situation such as somebody with a sip-n-puff. And the individual was actually visiting with my staff member and actually was using their straw there to actually vote with the machine. It was like, we weren't quite sure how that was going to work, but they actually demonstrated it to us. It was important that we brought in as many people that would be using the equipment.

DR. KING:

Okay thank you, you make a really excellent point. In fact, I wrote it down, it's so good, which is getting the stakeholders involved in the validation of the plan for the acquisition, not just in the approval of

the selected system. And I think that's good advice for any jurisdiction to look at.

Next I've got Joe Losco.

DR. LOSCO:

Thanks, Merle. Let me add my thanks to the EAC for the invitation to be here. I'm delighted to share with you what we think are the critical roles that the EAC Clearinghouse plays for us.

I'm part of a four-person team called the Voting Systems Technical Oversight Program at Ball State University. It was established in 2008 by the General Assembly. After the first round of HAVA money was spent, it was determined that some of the machines, they weren't quite sure whether they worked the way they were supposed to, and the Indiana Election Commission decided it needed more hands-on testing and evaluation of new machines that came into the state for certification. So, in 2008 VSTOP was created. It was put out for bids to various universities. The state desired to have a university partnership with the testing unit, and it is now housed at Ball State University. The VSTOP mandate is to develop procedures and standards for certification, to perform necessary testing, to ensure conformance to the Indiana code, to review lab reports, recommend approval of systems to the Indiana Election Commission, and assorted additional duties, including the creation and maintenance of an inventory database. In Indiana, we have 92 counties, multiple vendors. It's necessary to make sure we know where each machine is, from each vendor, at all times. And we've performed that. We've put that together. But, there are growing responsibilities, as well. We are being asked

more and more often to monitor the quality of voting systems and see if there's an impact that may occur to our system as a result of some problems or anomalies that occur in other districts.

Let me mention four areas where I believe the Clearinghouse function is critical for what we do; certification, the ECO's, or engineering change orders, advisories, and the election official exchange.

First of all, in terms of certification, EAC certification is not necessary in Indiana. But when the EAC does approve a system, certify a system, and that's introduced into Indiana, we certainly are appreciative of the EAC reports and documents, and we consult them extensively. We look at the testing plans. We look at the VSTL reports that are housed on the site. We look at the EAC certification and approval documents. And the documents serve as a very useful double check for us. When we're looking at specific items that EAC checked for, but also are covered by the Indiana election Code, things like straight party voting, it gives us an extra layer of certainty and confidence if we know that EAC has examined it, so have we. We do hands-on testing anyway, but again, there's that extra layer of confidence we get from that redundancy.

In terms of engineering change orders, which we all know are becoming more and more frequent, we developed a protocol that heavily draws on EAC documentation. Specifically, we've used the conventions adopted in Section 3.5 of the EAC manual. We distinguish between modifications and de minimis changes in quite -- in exactly the same way. We use EAC testing reports where

there's an EAC system that's been approved and there are also ECO changes there. And, that's not only useful in saving us time from doing additional testing that's already been done on a system that's similar to ours, but it also saves the vendor money when there's no need to then go out and do additional testing that we request.

We also consult the EAC for advisories. And again, this is becoming an increasing part of our workload. This is exceptionally important. We're asked to monitor the quality of the systems. And sometimes we don't receive all of the advisories and bulletins in a timely manner. For quite some time the vendors would supply web portals to the county clerks, the county clerks then would consult the portals to see if there were any reported problems and fixes. That didn't always get communicated to the right sources. The Indiana Election Commission now is required that the vendors send those advisories to us at VSTOP. But, again, those are not always timely, and we find it quite useful to check the EAC website and Clearinghouse to see if there are any advisories that are there, that we have simply not received yet, or we can look for.

Where there are anomalies or problems that we find out about in other jurisdictions, we then turn to the election official exchange, which is quite important. We can go there and find other jurisdictions and states using the same equipment, and we can contact them and ask them for their information -- any information they have about those anomalies and fixes any problems that they've come across.

And lastly, let me mention something that was mentioned a little earlier, and that's just personal contact and referral. Karen Lynn-Dyson mentioned that she's available. She gave us her phone number. And I am very thankful that we have contacts here at the EAC when questions arise, that we're just not quite certain about, and we don't know exactly who to contact from the election official exchange, or we're not quite sure where our concerns might best be answered.

Just a quick example, the Indiana code has a somewhat confusing language when dealing with electronic op scan and DRE systems. It says that a mark that is placed -- that is touching or next to a circle or a square is to be counted as a vote. With an electronic system that's a little difficult to monitor. And so, we had extensive conversations, on the phone, with the staff here, the testing staff from the EAC, to determine how best to test that. We were put in touch with various testing labs to ask them for their advice, as well, and we were able to resolve that satisfactorily.

So, the EAC Clearinghouse is critical to just about all the functions we have.

DR. KING:

Okay. Joe, how old is your center?

DR. LOSCO:

2008 is when the VSTOP was authorized and we got started shortly thereafter. We were probably up and running by around 2009.

DR. KING:

Okay. A lot of states are interested in developing models like Indiana, that is partnering with universities to help with some aspect

of election administration. Could you speak to how the EAC was instrumental in helping you at the startup, and specifically, looking for advice to give other states about how to make that first phone call to the EAC to begin that conversation?

DR. LOSCO:

Absolutely, we certainly had a bank of expertise at Ball State that was interested in doing this kind of work. But, we had never actually gotten our hands on the equipment and worked with it extensively. So, contacting the EAC and finding other people, including the Center at Kennesaw, and being able to establish those kinds of personal contacts, the ability to be able to see what kind of models exist in other states for doing this kind of work, this kind of collaborative applied research. A lot of that early information that got us started and allowed us to put our model together, we derived from contact with EAC and other officials that they put us in touch with.

DR. KING:

Good, thank you Joe. Ernie McClellan.

MR. McCLELLAN:

Thank you, I'm Ernie McClellan. I am the Training Manager at the Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners. And I'm glad that the EAC invited me to participate with all of these industry veterans.

I'm probably the rookie on this panel, okay? But, I think that's why these materials really hit home for me. It really was interesting, as I was considering coming into the elections field, I started looking around at what I could find out about what was going on in elections, and the EAC's website was one of the

prominent places where I was able to really kind of get a good picture of what's happening in, I think as you know Doug described, this variety of systems that are going on.

My past experience in the private sector, really -- I spent a lot of time looking at best practices, doing a lot of measuring, tracking, trending and trying to understand process improvements and how we can improve performance. And I wasn't really sure how that would apply to what I considered to be a government space compared to a private space. But one of the things that stuck out to me right away is that, in this industry, we all have protected territories. We have friendly competition, you know, on our processes and our procedures and who's able to do things most efficiently, but we don't really compete with each other. So, we have a greater opportunity, I think, than anybody in a private enterprise would to really capitalize on the sharing of this type of information.

The primary resources that I've been able to tune in to and utilize in my role have been the college poll worker recruitment guides and the poll worker management -- the Poll Worker Recruitment, Training and Retention Guidelines, because I was told I was responsible for recruiting up to 1,200 poll workers and training them and, you know, it was expected that there's a level of accountability for me and for these folks that they're going to perform.

Fortunate for me, I came into an organization that had a good program in place. I am the type of person, I come in and I really kind of take the landscape in. I want to look around, see

what's happening and try to figure out, how can I make an impact? So, I looked around our organization and I saw that things were going pretty well. We had a good program in place. But then, when I started looking at the Poll Worker Recruitment, Training and Retention Guidelines, it gave me a platform to, instantaneously almost, look at best practices and see things that we were already doing, and we were doing well, and then, look at where the opportunities for growth within the program were, to find out, well, what are the best practices that have been determined that we aren't really utilizing yet. So, as I'm looking over the next two to three years as we try to bring our program into, you know, current times with the advent of social media, technology, and these types of developments, it gave me an instant place where I could look and see what we were doing well, and where we had places for opportunity, and then to try to figure out how do we actually bring these things to be? How do we actually move from a place where we're providing quality training, we're providing quality materials like the guide recommends; take-home materials, videos. We're doing that, but how do we bring that next step, that next level to what we're doing? How do we bring the accountability to it? How do we actually measure what we're doing, and not on an anecdotal basis, but in a way that we can actually track and trend what's going on? And I think Tammy might have mentioned earlier the constant new blood coming into the industry. And I was that new blood. So, the EAC materials gave me a place to go and really kind of do a down and dirty self-education of what's going on in the industry.

The other resource that I mentioned that we've utilized pretty heavily is the college recruitment materials. Our directors gave myself and our communication specialist the task of really stepping up our efforts in that area, especially as we look at the new technologies we're looking to use in our polling places. I think everybody at the table knows how advantageous it can be to have college students come and help to kind of mainstream that technology into our pool of poll workers where the average age exceeds 70, you know, to help them become comfortable with this and give them a sense of assurance about using the technology. And so, we pretty much took the program from the guide, pretty much lock, stock and barrel. I mean, we pretty much grabbed it, and I think that Karen encourages people to do that. We utilized the resources. We drew up the Memorandum of Understanding. We -- you know, we laid it out. It helped us set a timeline for our program. The communication specialist is brand new to the industry, too, and just out of college. So, it gave both of us an extra level of confidence, coming into an industry that was entrenched with people who were much more seasoned than we were, that we had a good sense of what was going on in the industry and how the plans we were putting in place compared to that. And it gave us some level of confidence that we could be successful based on looking at these past experiences.

And so, in short order, we kind of put this program together in the last quarter of last year, and we've launched it this year, and we started early as the guide suggests. We started at the top. We contacted, you know, the folks at the various universities in Kansas

City, and we got participation from every single one of them. We were able to get into the political science departments. We've been able to come into the classrooms. We've had events at all of these schools, so far, and we've been able to recruit, at this point, probably 30 to 40 poll workers, and we're in April. Of course, we're targeting August primaries and November general elections, but we started early. We wanted to make sure we could really get our feet wet and figure out if we were going to make a mistake, figure that early and figure out how to redirect. So, the materials have been invaluable to me, just by enabling us to get a quick start and not have to spend a lot of time wondering what was going on in the industry.

The other thing that I really think about when I look at the industry as a whole and, you know, how do we use these materials going forward, and I know we're going to talk about that later, but I think it's important, because it was mentioned earlier, you know, a lot of times we have tunnel vision and we can't see beyond our desk, even. We talk about jurisdictions and people, you know, being tied to their statutes or their processes. But a lot of times people can't see beyond their own desk, and if it's beyond that point, they really don't have a good concept of what's going on, like Section 203. We don't deal with Section 203, currently, in Kansas City, but I had the opportunity last year to sit with Tammy at lunch and listen to some of the things that are going on in her jurisdiction, and it gave me a wealth of knowledge about what I might need to be thinking about if we are faced with dealing with those type of requirements. It helps us to understand how do we -- what do we

measure and how we measure it. I think everybody here has kind of talked about the evolution of this industry, and I think the advent of social media and the dissemination of information and how that occurs now has caused all of us to realize that we don't operate in a vacuum, we don't really operate locally anymore, because the local story can instantly become the national story if it's interesting enough, or if it can be spun in a way that's interesting enough. And so, it helps us to really work towards that professionalization of the industry. We're all not going to do things the same way, but it helps to have that sharing of information, as we learn how to face these challenges, and as I think more attention is paid to the elections community, and people start to realize there is an industry here of professionals who are doing this work.

I think the biggest takeaway after having used some of the materials and what I think about will, you know, what's missing, I know for me I would consider I think according to most of your material, you'd probably call us a large jurisdiction, but there are some larger -- much larger than we are as far as number of voters we're dealing with. So, I consider us somewhere in the middle. But, when I think about how we use this information going forward, I think that we really have to bring involvement with the EAC and with the EAC materials closer to the people who are doing the work, because a lot of times, you know, leadership can be tuned in and leadership can understand the importance and leadership can understand the community and, you know, the existence of this profession. But, when I talk to some people who work in the profession and have worked in it for many years and are

professionals, they don't really consider themselves as part of a profession, as part of a community. And we talked about earlier, this community. And I think that the EAC's role and these materials help to kind of gel that community together, and it offers an opportunity for more people at every level, no matter what level you are in your organization, to really get engaged and feel a part of the community, even if you're not the director, if you're not the clerk, or if you're not a senior administrator of elections in your jurisdiction.

So, I'm glad to be here.

DR. KING:

Good, well thank you Ernie. I want to stay on our time schedule and Tom is going to make some closing comments, but I did want to reinforce a point that you made, is, in every election there are anomalies that occur in the precinct, and very often we kind of lump it together under human error. But the reality is that very often there's a training issue, either a new procedure has been introduced and overlooked, the training materials have not been revised, et cetera. And you raise a very important point that reinforces the theme that we've heard here about raising the level of expectations within our professions, and that's accountability. And trainers are among the most accountable people in the process, because every time there is a failure at the precinct level I know your heart speeds up because that comes back into the training.

So, maybe when we get into the future vision of this we can talk in more detail about what jurisdictions can do to bring these materials closer into, not only the statutes and the rules and regs of

the jurisdiction, but the abilities and the backgrounds of the people that are actually going to be implementing them. How do we customize the materials to those learners? So, thank you for that.

Tom, I'm going to let you have the last word. And you started this. You had this vision ten years ago about something that was mentioned in the HAVA bill about a Clearinghouse. And did you foresee this? Did you foresee this body of knowledge?

MR. WILKEY:

Well, Merle, let me be a -- take 60 seconds to be a little personal here, because who knows whether I'll have the opportunity to ever come back here or be invited to come back here again.

But, one of the things when I left here at the end of the year, I chose not to have a big farewell. And one of the many reasons I chose to do that is, how do you adequately tell a group of people, really adequately, tell a group of people what a tremendous job they had done in the time that you had worked with them? You see it today. You see the kind of things that over a period of ten years transpired into where we are today. Had I had a vision 42 years ago, when I started in this business, of, in the twilight, what I wanted to be most proud of, you saw it today. You saw it on the screen. You saw it in the comments that were made around the table. I hear it everywhere I am blessed to go in the United States today. And later on this year I'm going to be doing some training in some of the states and I'll be using this very material that we worked so hard to present.

You heard today from some of our stakeholders, those representing state and local officials, and certainly our goal when

we started out was to make sure that the little guy got as much as the big guys. And I think we accomplished that. Our major goal was to get down to the level where the action really happens. And, where I started out in this business was at the local level, and so, I knew that if we were going to do anything successfully it had to come down to the local level. It had to be a big part of everything that we did. And, frankly, our biggest support, over these years, have been from local election officials, because they've seen what we've tried to do for them.

So, we've heard from the state people. We've heard from the local people. We've heard from academia. But there's one segment that we have left out of the picture today, and that is the average American voter, John "Q" Public voter, the thousands of them who come to our website, particularly in the months preceding the election, to where they can find out, in every state in this country, how you get registered, how you get an absentee ballot, what the deadlines will be. That is another area that we have taken that responsibility seriously, so that every single voter in this country has an opportunity to go in, take a look at the state that they come from, click the state, and get every piece of information they need about how they get on the voter rolls, and what they have to do if they need an absentee ballot, or they need to go -- or how long the polls are open, and so on and so forth. So, I think we've covered all of the areas that we wanted to cover. And, again, it's something that I am very, very proud, and very proud to be associated with a group of people who put this together.

And I'm thankful, also, for the next segment, because I think it's important to talk about where we want to see where the future will be, because, as we all know, the future is in the balance. And your help, your support is, hopefully, someone will listen, someone with some -- the ability to make sure that this stays, this grows, it gets to carry on for future generations of election officials, for people like Ernie who just started in the business. And welcome, we need people like you. We need to have -- because it is an ever changing population of people.

And, just one more thing, I'm privileged to work with Tammy on the committee she mentioned. This is typical of Tammy's work, and nothing says it better, about the kinds of things that we did and how election officials are using it across the country. But, you know, when we get stuck on the committee and we don't know where we're going, we just turn to Tammy and Tammy figures it out. So, I'm glad you were able to be here also.

And again, it was a great privilege to be here again today, and I look forward to the discussion after the break.

Thanks Merle.

DR. KING:

Thank you. Well, thank you so much Tom. And that's a great summary, I think, of the last ten years, but also a peek into the vision in the future.

We are at our hard break. What I'd like to do is break for 15 minutes, be back, if we could, right at 11. We have a series of questions that we'll be going through. And let's take a break now and see you back at 11 o'clock, thank you.

[The EAC roundtable panel recessed at 10:45 a.m. and reconvened at 11:00 a.m.]

DR. KING:

Thank you, welcome back to the EAC roundtable on the Clearinghouse function. I encourage those of you who are watching to submit questions by Twitter or by going to the EAC website at www.eac.gov and we'll do our best to try to get to those questions. We have one that's come in, but I'm going to hold that until we get to the future directions for the EAC Clearinghouse.

Thanks to the participants for the intros this morning and your description about how you're using the Clearinghouse materials in your jurisdictions to impact elections.

What I'd like to do, now, is kind of throw some questions out to the group. And if there's only one person who responds, that's great. But if a couple of people want to respond, if you'd put your tent up on end like that, that helps me know that you want to get in the queue to answer the question. So let's spend about 30 minutes or so kind of wrapping up this first section on how the jurisdictions are using this material.

And the first question that I have is sort of, if not this, then what? In other words, if the EAC did not exist, if this repository of information, if this easily accessible collection of data and procedures and materials were not there, what would you do? What are your alternatives? And if you could, I think going back to what Jackie mentioned earlier, that perhaps cost data is a piece

that's still missing out of our data collection, if you can give some kind of rough estimate of what would be the cost associated. I know as a training director, the development of good training materials is very cost intensive. So, I throw that question out to the group. Without the existing Clearinghouse function of the EAC, what alternatives would you have for collecting comparable information? And can you estimate the costs that are associated with that?

Doug?

MR. CHAPIN:

I'll start. I think one opportunity in the absence of a formal Clearinghouse function would be, we're starting to see, with the advent of social media and the development of online feedback loops, this notion of crowd sourcing. I like to call it crowd geeking of data. And I think partly through some of the work that the EAC did with its data collection grants, but also work that states and localities have done on their own, we have an opportunity for states and localities to, essentially, put data out there on the work that they're doing. I think that the model that's developed so far is required surveys, jurisdictions put the data in, they begin to recognize the value of that data. I mentioned during my remarks, this notion of, we can't force people, or in the absence of mandating that people respond to data requests, much like Americans have to file tax returns, can we find a way to make provision of data something that jurisdictions want to do. And I think now that people recognize all of the benefits that everyone on the panel has described today, if we found a way to take what the EAC has begun

and create an opportunity to crowd source or crowd geek that data, put it in one or more central repositories, into which people could put data and out of which people could take guidance, that would be I think an alternate to the current system.

Costs, I think it will depend on how exactly that gets set up. I think that you might have either private or non-profit organizations that would be willing to house that. Certainly, you've got institutions like Minnesota, Kennesaw, Ball State, who might have, not just academic, but some institutional interests in being home for that kind of data. But having a system whereby election officials can put data in and get data out, both to supply answers and get answers to their questions, I think would be a sort of one to many, many to one solution that would, if necessary, would replace the current kind of hub and spoke system that the EAC has set up.

DR. KING:

Okay. Ernie?

MR. McCLELLAN:

Well, I'll speak to, I guess, just, you know, looking at it from the viewpoint of what it would take to actually create the types of research documentation, and the type of polling place materials. I can't quantify the costs, because obviously the process would be laborious, it would be disjointed, and it probably wouldn't be very, you know, succinct as it is now. But, I think that when we look at like the polling place materials, for example, that's the next area that -- no one back in Kansas City knows this -- but that's probably the next thing that I'm looking to utilize, because when we talk about -- and everybody has intimated the professionalism of the

industry, and how do you convey that, and how to you get that message across to the public that we're a professional industry. And I think a lot of it goes right back to kind of the look and feel of the industry. What is the experience? When I come into the polling place, what do the materials look like? If all of the signage and all of the things that are up on the board are dog eared and kind of look governmental, or look old or stale, I think that sends a message about our industry and about the level at which we're operating. So, when I take that disc and I look at all of those polling place materials that are there, and I know that if I have, you know, Adobe I can go in and customize all of these materials for my jurisdiction, but still maintain a consistent, professional and professionally developed look and feel. I can't quantify that because if we had to go out -- if each jurisdiction had to go out and engage a graphic designer to design those types of materials, I don't think it would be possible. So, I think it's up to us, you know, as people administrating elections to really take those materials and use them. And like Doug said, you know, how do you motivate people to want to use them versus having to try to make people use them, make people understand that, you know, using that material is going to help you look better. If the press is coming into your polling place, I mean, it just gives you a better image, a more professional image. So, I can't really quantify it, but I think it's an invaluable resource for us to be able to tap into.

DR. KING:

One question that I have Ernie, one of the things I think that always concerns any designer of materials is how will I vet these

materials? And it can be as simple as proofreading, but often it's much more complex, because it requires a contextual understanding of the application. Does the use of EAC vetted materials add to the confidence of local election officials as they incorporate those materials into their training or their poll worker placement

MR. McCLELLAN:

Oh, absolutely. It gives you a level of confidence because, one, you know that it's been professionally created, and it's been created not in a vacuum, not utilizing your own knowledge and experiences, but it's been developed, you know, based upon a breadth of input. And we all know that you have to have that constant input from all the different stakeholders, and all of the different key folks that are involved. So, I think it adds a significant level of confidence to the people using the material, versus, you know, just designing something yourself and creating it and throwing it out there.

DR. KING:

And for a new guy that's probably a very important value that those materials bring to it. All right, thank you.

I've got Jackie, and then, I think Joe.

MS. HARRIS:

I think it would be very difficult to replace this concept of the Clearinghouse. I really love Doug's thought of having this kind of interactive, live, you know, vetting of issues. And I think it's one of the things that we enjoy most about being in groups like this, is that we immediately go out into the hallway and quickly share all sorts

of data with one another. And that's a great way to learn. But from my perspective, when I'm walking into the Legislature, one of the most important things is that I can credential my sources, so that I can show that it's an authentic source, and that it's a source without any interjection of bias, or an appearance of the interjection of bias, because they want to know that I didn't get this from somebody that they may think may have a particular political slant or an objective in providing the data to me. So, I think that's something that the Clearinghouse can give to me because I can pull up a report and say, "This is the source of this documentation and it's coming from a source that's meaningful to the Legislature. I think that would be very difficult to replace, and I don't think I could replicate it on the local level. Even by calling colleagues, et cetera, I can get kind of anecdotal evidence, but I don't think I could ever replicate this type of comprehensive dataset.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you Jackie. Joe?

DR. LOSCO:

Yeah. When it comes to testing and certification of voting equipment, I think the greatest cost, if EAC materials weren't available, certainly, would be time. We'd have to look to other states and make our own contacts, in terms of finding out what protocols are used, how successful they are, what might be copied, what might be -- what you might want to stay away from.

But, you know, short of something like an additional network, and I guess that's possible, there were -- last year there was a conference of some of us who do certification at Kennesaw. We're

holding another one at Ball State this year. Certainly, that's a useful adjunct. But I see that as something filtering back to EAC, so that those folks who can't make it can take advantage of common concerns, problems, and solutions that we may develop in those face-to-face meetings. Those who can't attend can go to the Clearinghouse.

DR. KING:

Okay. I'd like to follow-up with Joe's comment, just an observation, that prior to the formation of the EAC much of the data, that those of us involved in testing voting systems had access to, was really just happenstance; that if a vendor chose not to provide a system for testing to your jurisdiction, that there was really no way to get access to that. And one of the great benefits that's come about as a result of the testing program, particularly, is that jurisdictions have access now to data of new vendors coming onto the market, as well as vendors that they've never seen before in that jurisdiction.

One of the more sometimes painful part of that process goes back to Doug's viewpoint of the advantage of having this vigorous and robust public debate, crowd sourcing, if you will, over issues. And without the forum of the EAC to conduct that debate on security in voting systems, that debate would have been more fractured, more difficult to follow and produce less results. So, there's many advantages I think from the voting system testing aspect that gives states access to a much richer repository of data than they could get on their own.

Steve?

MR. MORENO:

I was just trying to frame my thoughts from a lot of the comments that were just made here, and just of what the skeptics may think of this information that we may not have if it was not for the Clearinghouse research that's done and the best practices and the lessons learned of what to do in being compliant of meeting the federal laws and the state laws. And when I think about the cost factor, I think that was one of the things that you asked earlier about, what would you assess as far as a cost factor with this if we didn't have this in place. Obviously, if we're not compliant you're going to end up in litigation and the enormous costs with litigation through the Courts of trying to decide whether you're complying with the mandates are outlined through what the Clearinghouse has put together and things that have been learned in the professional manner of how we should conduct testing, as you said, of the voting equipment, for instance, that we're doing things right and building that trust back into the confidence of the process of our elections throughout this country.

DR. KING:

Okay, I have another question for the panel and it has to do with impediments to utilizing the Clearinghouse function. And sometimes the impediments can be structural. It can be the organization of the data, the organization of the materials. Other times it may be format driven, accessibility issues related to it. Is there any observations that you have about challenges to utilizing the Clearinghouse related to those two criteria or additional criteria?

Tammy.

MS. PATRICK:

I mentioned a little bit in my comments about some of the challenges we had in The Election Center benchmarking taskforce using some of the information, and I think that it really boils down to a couple of issues.

One issue, I think, is, again, the interpretation of the definition of what the question is really asking in the Election Day survey. I don't have any challenges gaining access to the minority language materials or whatever, so most of my comments are just driven to the dataset. So, there were challenges there in the interpretation of the individuals filling out the survey and what the real question was that was being asked. And I gave the example earlier of how many ballots being mailed out.

Another challenge was, something again that I had already mentioned, which is the changing of the questions where they appear, so it was harder to kind of cross questional things. And, of course, we're all doing this in our spare time when we're not, you know, having elections, which isn't very often. So, there was some additional challenges there.

But one of the big challenges that I found wasn't with the survey itself, but happened to be with the participation of some of my colleagues across the country. In a meeting last year, I was at a meeting with people from all over the country and someone actually said, "Well, we know that the counties aren't giving us accurate data, but we have no way of getting the right information. And nobody uses it anyway." So, I will let you know that I did stand up, quite vociferously, and said, you know, "Maybe you're not using this, and that's too bad because the information is exceedingly

helpful and can help to improve your own performance. But just because you're not using it doesn't mean that other stakeholders aren't. It doesn't mean that DOJ is not going to look at this information and see whether or not you have an excess registration of your population. It doesn't mean that other oversight groups aren't going to be looking at it to see whether or not you exceed kind of the standards that are set across the country.”

So I think that part of the problem is getting our colleagues to see the value in capturing the information, reporting it accurately, and then using it, as well. All of that does take some time, but it doesn't necessarily have to include a lot of resources if it's put into how you gather your information and do your processes. There is a way to kind of incorporate a lot of the data collection so that it doesn't take a lot of time and resource.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you. Any other comments, Joe?

DR. LOSCO:

There is a lot of valuable data, as we've all been talking about, on the EAC website. Perhaps integrating some of it in ways that are a little more user friendly is something we could look at in the future, and each of us look at different parts of the EAC website, depending on what our specialties are, but for instance, being able to track type of election system by state used. I know there are different parts of the website that have that, but also then, contact information with people who are part of the certification process in that state. Being able to cross reference all of this information with advisories, bulletins, et cetera, on that particular system, certainly

would make things -- would streamline them a little. But I think from what I've seen, the site is getting closer to that.

DR. KING:

Okay, I think Joe really raises an important point, not only about the EAC Clearinghouse in its structural format, but really, its philosophy, which is, it's a way to not only connect people to data, but to connect people to people. And ultimately, in our profession, those personal contacts can yield the very answers to our unique questions in a quick way. And so, whether that's having direct access to staff here at the EAC, or through the Clearinghouse function, the listing of election officials, that directory for example, those are all hugely beneficial.

Doug?

MR. CHAPIN:

Yeah, real quickly, one comment I've heard from folks out in the field is that, to the extent it's possible, to make resources like the exchange available, sort of, outside the world of simply election officials that would be helpful. I understand that there is a need for a safe space for election administrators to share problems and the like, but to the extent that we can find a way to, maybe, make those boundaries a little more porous between academics and election officials, either individuals, or the organized public, and the profession, would be helpful. I don't know if there's some middle ground between a straight-up exchange and sort of a free-for-all, like blog comments, but if there's some place where, not just actual election officials, but academics, researchers, the organized public and the like can ask and answer questions would be really helpful.

DR. KING:

You know that is an excellent point, and I hope when we come back and talk about the future directions that you'll come back and revisit that. I do know that the exchange is used by election officials. I also know it's used by the media. The media will often use it to identify experts. But perhaps it can do more. Perhaps it can create this kind of bridge, this reboot between the academic and election community. So, I think that's an excellent point.

I have one more question related to kind of the current state of affairs, and then, we're going to move on to the future directions. And it has to do with kind of the spectrum across the expertise level that the Clearinghouse addresses. And Tom made an excellent point that voters, and sometimes very informed voters, but sometimes curious, sometimes looking for just fundamental information about precincts, those kinds of things, but designing a tool that functions across a spectrum of expertise is clearly a challenge.

So, my question is, applications of the design to accommodate expert as well as novice users rarely succeed in accomplishing both goals. How would you access -- how would you assess the EAC's Clearinghouse function for the expert user? How would you assess it for the novice user? How is it functioning across that spectrum?

Doug?

MR. CHAPIN:

I'm trying not to use all the airtime. I think in many jurisdictions across the country election officials are already doing a good job of

assisting their voters with the kind of voter level, individual level questions. So, to the extent that you have to choose to serve some visitors and redirect others, I think that the Clearinghouse is better as a community tool for the field and for researchers, and then a finding -- it should be a finding aid for voters. You know, groups like PEW's voting information project, "canivote.org" with the Secretaries of State are very focused on helping voters answer questions like, where do I vote? What's on my ballot? What are the rules and deadlines for casting a ballot? To the extent that you have a simple way for an incoming voter to be redirected to the -- for a proper community to answer those questions, I think it's valuable. To the extent you want to focus more substantive material, I think -- if you're looking at trading off expert versus novice users, I think that the Clearinghouse ought to focus more on expert users, and then, just have a very straightforward way to redirect...

DR. KING:

Um-hum.

MR. CHAPIN:

...novice or -- redirect voters. And then, to the extent you got novices, whether it's a new member of the profession or a reporter who's just been assigned to the beat, having a really clear progression of quick and dirty answers, advanced beginner answers, here's the deep weeds.

DR. KING:

Okay. And is that in part because there are -- there's many sources for the novice user. Usually every Secretary of State will

have a website. But there's not many, if any, resources for expert users beyond the EAC Clearinghouse.

MR. CHAPIN:

I think that's right. I think the EAC is one of a small handful of institutions that has, you know, going back to this notion of competition that has a competitive advantage with other entities with regard to the community speaking to one another about really meaty issues in the field.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you. Tom?

MR. WILKEY:

I think one of the impediments that EAC had from the very beginning was in the notion that the Federal Government trying to tell localities how to do their business. We particularly saw that at the state level where, you know, we don't -- what are we going to get from the Feds, and what is the Fed going to teach us that we don't already know? And what they failed to understand, and what, after awhile, of particularly being out in the field and talking to groups of people is that none of these items, the Election Management Guidelines, the Quick Starts, many of the projects that you see that we -- that the EAC accomplished, were done with actual participants from state and local election offices. Every single Quick Start that was done, every single Management Guideline that was done, groups of people we brought in from all over the country, big, small, medium, rural, urban, to sit with us, so that we had the expertise going into every subject area that we covered.

When it came to the Election Day Survey, it just didn't come down, you know, we dumped a bunch of data on the table and said, "Here is it, let's publish it." There was a lot of care and attention that was given to that over a period of months and months and months, to make sure that when we put something out that it was accurate. And so, if we saw something that was off, didn't look right, Karen's staff, and Shelley, who is over there, worked very hard on this, would make sure, "Let's call the jurisdiction. This doesn't look right. We don't want to put anything out there that would give any of our jurisdictions a problem." But you know -- so there were many calls made to local jurisdictions and state jurisdictions saying, "This just -- are you sure this is right? This just doesn't look good to us." And they'd get back and say, "Ooh, we have to fix this."

So, all of the products that you see today and what you're seeing, the public is seeing, hopefully, over our website, and webcam, is that all of these things were put together with the assistance, the cooperation, the involvement of state and local election officials. It wasn't a bunch of feds sitting in Washington developing a bunch of stuff that people could not use. It was actual experiences that those people brought to the table that created this.

DR. KING:

Thank you, Tom. Any other comments on kind of the current state of affairs, where we are with the EAC Clearinghouse, insights into the jurisdictions' current applications?

Okay, well, then in our last hour of the program I'd like to move onto what may really be the most important part of the

program, which is the future of where are we going with the Clearinghouse, what are the jurisdictions' needs, what are the emerging technologies that we may even be able to take advantage of. And to kick that off, we're going to have two speakers from the EAC, first Karen Lynn-Dyson, and then Brian Hancock, kind of set the tone. And I'll ask Karen to begin her presentation, and then, we'll move to Brian, and then we'll have some questions for them and then questions for the group.

Karen?

MS. LYNN-DYSON:

Okay, before I get into some of my really what are kind of general musings about thinking about the future of the Clearinghouse, wanted to say at the outset that I think we all know those of us who are in public service a lot of caveats to thinking about the future, planning for the future, strategy, sessions and all. So, I say that we certainly have to think about the broadest or most narrow interpretation of our HAVA mandate to be a Clearinghouse of information. We also have to think about once we have a full Commissioner quorum where that stands in terms of a process for codifying or developing or planning any future programming. Similarly, down in the weeds, just a little bit, we labor under something called the Paperwork Reduction Act, so that every time we, as EAC researchers, get into the proposition of gathering information, be it more than nine people, we go through a rather rigorous vetting process. So, when we think about planning and developing a larger Clearinghouse, and what that looks like, that's kind of what we have to operate with.

I'm really struck, and continue, frankly, as I look nationally, and look at what my colleagues are doing in other national organizations or government organizations, there's an enormous amount of information that's out there, that's being gathered, that's being utilized in other fields. And I think there's a lot for us to learn in the elections community. So, as I think about it, I think about what should this EAC Clearinghouse, this EAC's 21st Century library of information look like. And I think that I have an obligation as one of the keepers of this 21st Century library to really be -- keep abreast of the emerging technology and the new forms of information sharing that other institutions, other entities are doing. And so, I promise that I will learn how to use the PowerPoint.

So, I kind of have three things that I tick off quickly. Again, this is from the perspective of the Research, Policy and Programs Division. And I look to my colleague in the first instance on strengthening the election official exchange, I look to really what Brian's shop has done in that regard, because I think, first and foremost, we, I, need to figure out a better way of building a connection with each and every incoming local election official and some strategies, some thinking around how to do that systematically, so that before that election official -- or I should say shortly after, you know, he or she gets the key to the restroom, that they say, you know, you really should go on EAC's website, because there are all of these things out there, and how do we take what's already there and do a much better job of doing things that many of my other colleagues are doing around governments and

organizations with webinars and podcasts. I think there's a lot of use of those going on, and we need to be doing that kind of thing.

I think, secondly, this idea that's very big around evidence-based practice tool kits. We've talked a little bit about successful models, performance measures, possible standards, criteria. And I think that we can serve the EAC as a community of practice for doing that, as a forum in which to build these competency models to talk about successful models.

In a similar kind of way you think about something like the Wiki function that a lot of folks are using to improve and manage updates and editorializing of existing documents. I would like to see us, when we go to the next iteration, on some of the things that you have sitting in front of you and are listed I talked about this morning, that we take advantage of a Wiki function to have a community of practice come in and talk about, "Well, we don't really do it this way," and have -- you know, "I would add this, I would, you know, put this in, I would take that out."

I think the final big piece is, and Shelley Anderson, the Deputy Research Director, and I talk a lot about this, and that's data dashboards. Doug mentioned crowd sourcing or crowd geeking. Shelley is a very active participant in what we have across the Federal Government something called data.gov, and she participates very actively on a monthly and a quarterly basis. Data.gov it's the go-to source of government data on anything and everything you can think of. All of our Election Administration and Voting Survey data is in there, it's available.

And related to that, I'm hoping that when we continue to the next phase of our existence we can -- using the data dashboard idea, we can build a very robust GIS capability. And we'll have to spend a lot of time, of course, thinking about what are the parameters of that. Should we be providing deep knowledge and information to the individual voter? Well, if not, then, going up a level, how much information should we be providing to county jurisdictions who can do cross county comparisons? I know my colleagues in other fields in juvenile justice, child welfare, workplace development, those are fields I know fairly well, I know they're doing a lot of cross tabulation and cross comparison. We ought to be able to let county officials do that so they can compare one another and actually just go into a system and they're literally doing -- you know, they're entering data and it automatically is cross tabulating.

And I think, finally, related to this data dashboard idea that Shelley and I would see as really making a very rigorous, very robust kind of thing that looks like some of the illustrations that you saw earlier this morning, how can we help jurisdictions improve their data gathering over time? I think Tammy's touched on it. We hear it over and over again, I've even actually gotten a couple of rounds of applause because we haven't changed the EAVS, the Election Administration and Voting Survey, over time. And we all know it takes time for folks to get used to things and they're finally really used to it. So, "Please, please, please don't touch it."

The things that I will leave you all to think about would be, and this is the kind of thing I think about and muse about, is when is

it too much information? When is it -- I mean, as I go around and I look at my peers and what they're doing, I look pretty closely at the tweets, you know, the likes, the dislikes, the last time somebody had something to say. And I'm struck, this glass half empty, here, I'm struck at how many times people haven't really tweeted or commented in over a year or in nine months. And it's -- you know, it's, you know, a rush of excitement, a rush of interest, and then people are like, "I have way too much"-- you know as Ernie said, "I can't even get past my desk, you know, I can't even get past my screen or my telephone, and you want me to be out there, you know, looking at this and looking at that and I just don't have the time." So, I think that we need to be very careful and judicious in what we put our energies into. And when we see -- when we put trial balloons out there and we see, you know, not so much, then pull back, you know, and go in a different direction. I mean, don't just be podcasting to be podcasting, and webinars to, you know, to be out there because someone is looking for, you know, a bully pulpit or whatever. So, we need some help on figuring out what are the best methods, what are the best modalities for us to deliver the information that you need that's most critical, and delivering it timely and useful.

And I think my final comment is, and I think you touched on it just a little bit Merle, I mean, kind of the perennial comment we get is, "Oh my gosh, I can't find my way around the EAC website." And so I think that in a perfect world if I -- if someone dumped a boatload of dollars on us I would sit there and I would say, "I want to be like, you know, Goggle, when we grow up," so that you can

just sit there and you can type in the most random, you know, ill-formed thought around election administration and the process, and miraculously, you could get to EAC's website and, bingo, you know, there it is. Someone has kind of read your mind or, you know, the search engine, the EAC search engine has read your mind, in terms of how to grab this piece of information that you're looking for, and it just so happens this is where it is, and you don't have to put just the right words in there.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you Karen, I appreciate it. I do have some questions to come back to, but I think I'm going to wait until after Brian's presentation. Then we'll address the EAC as a whole.

Brian?

MR. HANCOCK:

Thank you Merle, appreciate it. I'm Brian Hancock, Director of Testing and Certification at the EAC and happy to be joining you here for this part of the discussion.

In preparation for what we're talking about now, the sort of the future and moving forward, I looked at some different federal agencies' Clearinghouse. The Clearinghouse function is not new. It's not breaking any ground for the Federal Government. Almost every agency has some sort of Clearinghouse. I looked at Small Business Administration, NIH, HHS, the EPA, the FCC. Everybody has a Clearinghouse, right? But there are some -- if you look at them, there are at least two levels of commonality, something that - - two various areas that they all share in common, and it shouldn't be surprising to anybody.

One is information resources, reference materials and reports and publications. Everybody does that. We do that. And that's great. And obviously we need to be there . The other thing is frequently asked questions, FAQs, and lessons learned. Almost every agency has that. And, again, that's something we currently do and probably should move forward with.

Beyond that, it really seemed that each agency had very specific information for their specific audience, right, whether it's hotlines in some agencies, current projects or clinical trials for HHS, things like that and, depending on the agency, information on how to do your job better. But, again, it's very specific information for their specific audience. And I think as we move forward that's where we need to be, and this gathering helps a lot in that area.

Frankly, the EAC's Clearinghouse should be whatever state and local election officials need it to be and think it should be, you know. We can do some pretty good educated guessing, here, at what we think election officials need, but we really need to hear from you to tell us what information is most important to you and what it is that you need on a daily basis. And that's where we should move to.

Of course, some things that we've done in the past, we should continue to, I think, post reports from various resources on experience with electronic voting systems. We've got very good feedback on some of that information. Doug, the idea of costing elections is very interesting. There's some challenges there, in costing elections, but I think it's important and perhaps something we should think about. Research into new technology used in

elections, I know somebody talked about that this morning and that's very interesting. And we've, at least, in my division, sort of gone there. We look at new technology and are going to think of ways to help get the information out there and say, you know, what it is, and perhaps, how it works, and perhaps, why you should use it, as well.

I think something we really haven't talked about, except a little bit, is improving relationships. And I'm not talking about improving relationships with you and Mrs. King, but I'm talking about improving relationships with stakeholders. And you and Doug touched on this a bit. I think, particularly, in the area of academics, computer scientists and election officials, we can do more work. Those are two stakeholders that have not always seen eye to eye, and perhaps sometimes have been talking past each other in an effort to get their points across. I think the resources that the Clearinghouse has can be used as a common ground, common information, and perhaps, a way to initiate the improvement of communications between those two groups. I think, frankly, in the past two, three, four years, we've really come a long way in that area, but we have a lot further to go. And I think that could perhaps be a venue -- the Clearinghouse could be a venue for doing that.

Finally, Joe Losco brought up something interesting before, and it's information about voting systems, specifically issues. And we should make the point that even though everyone is using their own specific version of a voting system in there, that may not be an EAC certified voting system, a lot of the problems or issues that we

encounter, you know, are not necessarily unique to one specific version of the system but go -- sort of cut across system versions. And so, in that way it's important not only for states that use EAC certified systems, but states that use systems that are very similar to EAC certified systems. So, I think that's important, as well, and the more we can get that concept out there, I think, the better off we'll all be.

And lastly, I think, to piggyback on something that Karen mentioned, was, there are practical challenges to maintaining the Clearinghouse. And, really, the more information we have, in some respects, the more difficult it is to maintain, and we need to be cognizant about the practical aspects of that. In fact, I got an e-mail this morning, from someone out in the elections community, about a report that we have on the Clearinghouse. It was a state report that we linked to. And probably, we need to look at the linking aspect, because what has happened is the particular state where that report originated is no longer supporting that link and took that information down, and so, it's no longer ours. What we probably should do is get those reports, get hardcopies of those reports, and not link to the state because, you know, they may change. The state may not be able to maintain their website for whatever reason. Changing administrations may have different priorities in states. And so, I think getting that information and having it here and being able to maintain that ourselves is really important and a very interesting, practical challenge that we're going to face moving forward.

So, those are my initial thoughts Merle.

DR. KING:

Okay.

MR. HANCOCK:

I'd be happy to talk some more about this later.

DR. KING:

Okay, well, thank you Brian. I want to address a question, now, to both Karen and Brian, about the Clearinghouse function here at the EAC. In the design of information systems, an important criteria to look at is often referred to as the total cost of ownership, which is, over the lifetime of that system, what is it going to cost your organization to own it. And what's important about that process is identifying that sometimes the method of creating the information system can be very low cost for deployment, but it exacerbates the maintenance of it over the long haul, and the maintenance can literally eat you out of house and home. The takeaway is that the strategies that are needed, the philosophy, the outlook, the energy, the talents, all of the things that are needed to initiate a project, like the Clearinghouse, may or may not be in the same skill sets for its custodial mission down the road.

And so, what I'd like to address to both Karen and Brian is this first question, that the efforts required to initiate a project are usually different from those required to maintain that custodial role. The leadership skills, priorities that were needed to launch the Clearinghouse may be very different from those that are needed to maintain its quality. And Brian, your observation about dead links on a website, you don't think about those as you're developing the website, because everything works when it comes out of the box.

Discuss the EAC's strategy for addressing this emerging custodial role of the Clearinghouse.

And I'll first turn to Karen, and then Brian, for that. What are your thoughts on how the agency needs to assess this custodial role, and what might be different in it as opposed to its creation and rollout role?

MS. LYNN-DYSON:

Well, I think Merle, probably as -- in an operational sense is as good example as any, is, let's take the updating of some of these materials. And, as I described in my little brief remarks, the Wiki, there is, perhaps, such an economies of scale or economical savings, if you will, if we did this all online. There's no need, perhaps, to reconvene, face-to-face, a series of folks from around the country to come together and update the poll worker guidebook. That was a project that initially, you know, cost the -- it was a very great project, it was a very reasonable economical project. But, there's no need to reconvene folks if we now have these great communities of practice that -- and tools for people doing that. Let's just get people online, and online editing, with track changes, and we can control that whole process that way. And I think -- I would also add that, you know, like Brian, I spend a lot of time poking around and looking at what our colleagues and peers around the government are doing, and I have to think there are amazing personnel out there who could, perhaps, not election official experts by any means, but as a national agency, an entity, let's take advantage of some of the folks who are out there and, you know, let's just see. They're some expert in another federal

agency who, all he or she does is run podcasts, or all he or she does is run webinars. Well, we don't need to, you know, find the contractors to do that. We just merely need to provide the content for that. And I think, you know, those are just -- and that is the real beauty of being in a national setting, to be able to do that. We have -- we can avail ourselves of those resources.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you. Brian, your thoughts on the kind of skills and -- leadership skills, particularly, that will be needed to go forward on the custodial role of the Clearinghouse.

MR. HANCOCK:

Yeah, I mean, I think it's obvious, and sort of echoing some things Karen says, we have to work smarter. That's probably the number one thing. It's no real secret, in the best case scenario, that we're downsizing, and are going to have to do more with less as we move forward. There was a time when we started the Clearinghouse, got the website up that, you know, we had more staff. We had probably more resources, you know. But we're thinking of different ways to do things right now. A lot of the things, initially, that our communications division did to maintain the website, to maintain the Clearinghouse, has been brought down to the division level. Robin Sergeant, in my division, maintains a lot of the Clearinghouse/testing and certification information now, directly. Karen's division does that, as well. And so, I think we just have to use the resources that we have and use it more wisely. But, I think we can still do the job.

DR. KING:

I was thinking about Ernie and trainers. Certainly, corporate trainers have had to learn to apply their skills within online based formats. And, I think what I hear Brian saying is that maintaining that contextual expertise within the EAC, but prioritizing the skills for professional development of the staff so that they can support these kinds of Internet-based tools for use would be a priority going into the future.

I have a question, now, that I'd like to start by asking the group first, and then, kind of bring it back to Karen and Brian, and it has to do with something that Brian said. To me, it's one of those 'bell the cat' comments. It's a great idea, now how do we do that? His question -- or I'm sorry, his observation was that the ultimate goal of the Clearinghouse is to provide useable, valuable information to the stakeholders, and that the stakeholders have to be engaged in defining what that data is and the properties of that data; its currency, its format, et cetera.

And so, my note that I made here is, how do we get there? How do we improve the process of stakeholder engagement, stakeholder involvement, stakeholder input, into the process of defining the role of the Clearinghouse? I think some of those are already in place. The EAC Advisory Board is one tool for doing that, but that often doesn't get down into the levels of the weeds. So, I'd like to throw that question out to the group. How can the EAC get stakeholders more engaged in defining these information needs? And then, I want to ask the EAC staff. So, Ernie, I'll go to you first, and then Tammy.

MR. McCLELLAN:

Well, you must be in my head. Listening to Karen talking about Wiki, listening to Brian talking about, you know, potential contracting of the organizational structure, and how do you maintain that. And I think you have to really put ownership of the content out into the field with stakeholders to a greater degree. And so, that might mean that you've got different content area leaders out in the field who are coordinating groups of their peers around the country, who are maintaining and promoting or editing new materials. But I think that that will provide that grassroots kind of bilateral communication. When we talk about engagement, you know, if we've got a mostly one-way communication model, the engagement won't occur, unless people feel like I have the opportunity to give feedback, back into the system, and then, I can see that work through the system and I see a different output or I see some change come as a result of that. So, I think that that is a way to move what the EAC has created into a realm where the people in the field really take ownership of it. And that also kind of dissipates some of that feeling that Tom talked about of the Federal Government coming to tell us what to do, and it becomes, we're telling ourselves what to do, and we're deciding as a consensus of professionals how best to proceed.

DR. KING:

Ernie, you raise a really good point, in that, a part of the credibility of data has a lot to do with this pedigree. And so, by extending the ownership of these data collections to the owners, to the stakeholders, may not only engage the stakeholders, but it may

increase the veracity of that information because then the pedigree is known. That's a good observation.

Tammy, and then Barbara.

MS. PATRICK:

One of the things that I was thinking of is that the EAC has such a great national presence at the national conferences and conventions, and it's been a great resource for those of us who can attend those on occasion. But earlier we were talking about some of the smaller jurisdictions and the rural jurisdictions that can't afford to go to those types of meetings, and I was thinking that it would be great in a real world where there were funding and resources to send a representative to the state association meetings to kind of share what the EAC has on a person-to-person basis, for people who can't attend that. Now that, of course, costs money. So, then my second thought was that if it was possible to have a uniform presentation similar to this that's kind of a brief overview that could be presented at the national association meetings by someone from the state, sharing what the EAC has created, and that's available to members of the state's association, or if they have a certification training program, a brief panel on it, that wouldn't cost anything. But, in order for the EAC to get something back out of that to have a uniform sort of survey that could be passed around the room, then, that everyone wouldn't just get it as an e-mail, or get it while they're in their office, but they're in this setting that is conducive to taking a few minutes and completing it, filling it out, and then mailing those all back as a package, to the EAC, to find out what their feedback was on what

they saw. Now, some people will have experience with it and they'll be able to provide...

DR. KING:

Um-hum.

MS. PATRICK:

...that kind of feedback, but then, you'll have others that might be the first they've heard of it or seen of it. I know at our Arizona association meetings, I, because we usually have it at our facility and everyone comes to Phoenix, I put out the glossaries and some of the other materials, and some of the counties had never seen them before. And so, it's a great exposure, but it would be very cost effective, and it would be coming from someone that they know. So, that's just one of the thoughts that I had on that.

DR. KING:

I think that's an excellent idea, and I think it ties into Ernie's observation of pushing down the ownership to the stakeholders, and that, simply, making sure that there's an advocate at the state level will help collect that information, aggregate it, and then push it back to the EAC. That's a very smart solution.

MS. PATRICK:

Particularly, for states that have jurisdictions that now have Section 203 coverage, for them to know and to be able to see some samples of what the signage is that's available on the website for printing up. I think that that would be -- there's so many resources there that are available to people, I think, that just getting the word out a little -- in a new way to people who maybe haven't heard it before would be an opportunity.

DR. KING:

Okay, great, thank you. Barbara?

MS. DUNMORE:

I'm going to echo what Tammy and Ernie both said and, hopefully, add to it. I think what Tammy is describing and what came to my mind is sort of state ambassadors to the EAC, so that there is someone that is, you know, basically, has taken up this charge at a state level -- or not at a state level, but basically, representing the state that goes to these conferences, or goes around to the different counties and shares the EAC information. Perhaps there is a presentation that can be given at the local levels, so that they can become more familiar with the documents that are available.

And pairing on what Ernie was saying, what came to my mind was community support of certain sections of the EAC's website. And that's exactly what Ernie was talking about; that if we can have people in the different areas of elections, like training, or geographic information systems, or what have you, and they come together online to update reports, to add information. And then, in addition, as soon as something happens in the field that we never thought of before and now this is a presence, we can quickly have that information integrated into what's already out there and have it available for the elections community.

DR. KING:

Okay, great. Tom?

MR. WILKEY:

I like those ideas. And I think one of the tough nuts that we could not crack that we wanted to crack and just didn't know how to go

about it and it was somewhat difficult, was, we have -- we -- and I'm sorry, I keep using the term "we" -- EAC has, statutorily, as its two Boards, a Standards Board, a 110-member Board, and the Board of Advisors. But the one thing that I always thought we were missing, which I would have much rather have seen, if there's a legislator out there listening, is rather than the 110-member Standards Board, they have a board made up of the presidents of the election associations in each state, because, frankly, that's where the action is. And that's where I think we would have had the ability to reach more people.

It is amazing to me, as I would go out and speak at state association meetings, and show some of this kind of thing, and show the materials, or talk about the Clearinghouse and the website, they would look at you and they had never heard of it before. And they would go to their rooms that night, and invariably, the next day come up to me and say, "Wow, I didn't know you had all this stuff on your website. My goodness, I can't believe the amount of information." If we could have reached more of these kinds of people and had the ability to do that, I think we would have even made a bigger impact on what we wanted to do in terms of reaching local election officials, particularly.

And so, you know, that's the one nut we couldn't crack that I wish we could have. And I hope they can do it in the future.

DR. KING:

Well, it sounds like we have some suggestions here that might be built on, but let me turn that question, now, back up to Karen first, and then Brian. What are your thoughts on ways to better engage

stakeholders in identifying their needs, in identifying strategies for collecting that need, and then delivering the information?

MS. LYNN-DYSON:

Well, absolutely I love -- I loved just Ernie's, you know, articulate language about what I call communities of practice, but I like his much more eloquent grassroots bilateral communications. And I mean, it really is, because I -- kind of referring back to worlds I know now, as well as I know elections, I watch quite frequently what's going on around the government with these grassroots groups that are talking around their issue areas. And there is a deep mining of information and knowledge that these folks are doing on, generally, every couple of weeks. I mean, they are online talking to each other and really slogging through technical assistance, and providing, you know, service delivery to workforce people or, you know, juvenile justice, and child welfare, and things like that. I mean, I watch these, you know. It's password protected, but these folks are digging in online and they're really working through, given the financial parameters they have, "What can we do, what can't we do, can you do this, well, I'll do that." And we just need to be doing more of that and it can be done very economically. So, that, to me, is where we ought to be going. We need to create, you know, for starters, some silos, you know, some areas of expertise where people can really get online and talk about this. Trainers are talking about their stuff or managers are talking more globally. So, absolutely, let's put some pilots out there.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you Karen. Brian?

MR. HANCOCK:

Thanks, yeah, the information was great. And I agree with some of the ideas that the state officials' meetings are great, you know. I've been to West Virginia and I've been to Virginia and a lot of other states, and great information is shared there. And you're right, those are the people that need it, you know. There are a lot of great national groups out there. There's the Election Center, IACREOT, NASS, NACRC, and they're all great. But, probably, if you take the election officials, that only accounts for 20 to 30 percent at the upper end, probably, of the election officials. So, there is 70 to 80 percent of folks that we're not getting when we go to those meetings, and so, how to communicate with those people are important. I think we need to continue to try to develop those, you know, when we can, get out there, and when we can't, perhaps look to someone from the organization to help share the information. Very important

I think, specifically, for the certification, Merle, and Joe, the state certifications meeting that's had every year, that can be a venue for collecting, you know, information from you all as to what you'd like to see in our sort of section of the Clearinghouse, because that's sort of one a one-stop shop for the folks that will be most interested in that information. But getting down to the state associations is key, I think.

MS. LYNN-DYSON:

Merle, I would just -- I'm thinking, too, one of the things I want to devote some time thought/attention to is really this idea of chain of custody, not in the way that we all think of, but chain of custody in

terms of information that's passed on. I think we all know there is an issue in our field with turnover. And, you know, not putting a pejorative sense, I mean, people just for any number of reasons, come and go. What can we begin to do, as a national agency repository of information, to help with passing that information on, and so, that people aren't leaving and with them they're taking all of this material that was sitting on their bookcase. And, I'd really just like to, you know, dig down in the weeds and spend some time, can we build some systems, some structures that we know with every incoming class or new people, they will be getting this, this and this. There is that chain of custody of material, reservoir of knowledge, information.

DR. KING:

Okay, Brian.

MR. HANCOCK:

Just to piggyback on that, I think if we're going to do that, what we need to do is form a partnership with the national organizations, because NASED knows who the new election directors are coming in, you know. Some of the local organizations have a better handle on who their new folks are. And that's what we need to -- we have to form a partnership. We can't do it ourselves, not with the resources that we have available. So, I think the partnership concept is good.

DR. KING:

I think there are many intentional benefits of the Clearinghouse, and perhaps as many unintentional benefits of having this repository of data. And the one that strikes me the most, really

addresses the issue that both Karen and Brian were talking about, which is a historical reservoir of data, in that those of us who have been in the field for awhile, we know there's a lifecycle to ideas; they get refreshed and recycled every couple of years, or every couple of decades. And having this historical archive of data, I think, is an underestimated value that will increase as time goes forward.

I have time for one more question, and then, as I mentioned at the very beginning, we're going to have kind of a summarizing process to make sure we end on time at 12:30. The question to the group is information has many dimensions; it has currency, it has accuracy, it has relevance, it has depth, it has breadth. There's many, many values to information. Every organization has to look at its resources, it has to prioritize. And so, my question to the panel is, with these silos of information we heard them talk about today, we have the voting system certification material, we have training materials for poll workers, we have signage information, we have the election official exchange, we have the EAVS systems, and on and on. There's many of these silos of information that have already been developed. The question, I think, for the EAC going forward, is going to be prioritizing, maintenance, capping. What is your advice to the EAC, in terms of where to place its priorities on the Clearinghouse function? Are there new areas that should be identified and developed? Are there new methods that should be identified and developed?

So, I'll open up this section, how would you advise the EAC on establishing their priorities going forward with this function? And I'll start with Doug.

MR. CHAPIN:

Sure. I guess I would recommend, and this is consistent with what I've discussed already, I would, to the extent that the EAC is looking to prioritize, I would have the EAC prioritize on becoming an aggregator and a standardizer and a distributor of information, and think about trying to get out of the business, to a certain extent, of being a creator or an author of information. I think the field is maturing to the point where you're going to have really good material from people like those sitting around this table and folks across the country, and focus on making sure that the data that's coming from the field is standardized and accessible in a way that it can be shared, and not necessarily focus so much on the need to create information...

DR. KING:

Um-hum.

MR. CHAPIN:

...itself, whether that means hammering out a data standard, which may or may not get you out from under the Paperwork Reduction Act, whether it means being a Clearinghouse of links or aggregating information from other jurisdictions. I think your substantive breadth can remain as broad as it ever was, but to the extent that you are no longer the original author of material but are merely standardizing and redistributing material produced by the

field, I think you might be able to get far more bang for your existing, or maybe, dwindling buck.

DR. KING:

I think that's a good observation, and I think implied, Doug, but I want to ask you to clarify it, is, there is some things that are unique to the EAC, particularly, I think about the VSTL work, and the voting systems, that is not done by any other organization. But, prioritizing by recognizing that there are things that are unique to the agency that they may need to be originators of, but there are other things that aggregation, standardization, dissemination, may be the more effective strategies.

MR. CHAPIN:

Well, yeah, and to clarify, I think that the voting system work, I mean, that's -- there's another part of your mandate that's involved there. To the extent that you are generating information as a side effect of that mandate, yes. But I'm thinking maybe, specifically, of, like, the EAVS. If you had a data standard for collection and dissemination of the EAVS, you could then use, you know, public, quasi-public, private partners to help you generate that information, and let states not just own the data, but own the collection of it in a way that would maybe eliminate a lot of the churning that's involved in trying to pull that information like teeth from states and localities, give them excitement and ownership of creating and sharing it themselves rather than you being the driving force in creating and sharing it.

DR. KING:

Okay. And, in part, that's because you feel like the jurisdictions have matured in their understanding of the value of this data, and that they would continue to collect it and see the value to that.

MR. CHAPIN:

I think you have some jurisdictions have matured more than others. But quite frankly, I think, you know, to go to Tom's point, I think that if your colleague is encouraging you to collect data, that's going to be far more effective than the Federal Government. And quite frankly, I think we're on the cusp of a huge generational shift in the field of election administration, and if we get this kind of data collection baked into the profession, as soon as possible, it won't be something new and different for election officials, but something they've always done.

I mean, we talked about -- somebody mentioned social media. I mean, the biggest change with today's incoming workers isn't learning how to tweet, but how to stop, or when it's appropriate, right? And so, figuring out -- they will bring skills that the field needs, but to the extent that the field can be asking them to do things that the field needs long-term, is just as valuable. So, to the extent we can let jurisdictions, you know, like Tammy's, or Kansas City, or Weld County, lead the nation, with your encouragement, I think that will go a lot further toward populating the Clearinghouse than you all continuing to be both asker and answerer of lots of these questions.

DR. KING:

Excellent point Jackie?

MS. HARRIS:

I'd like to reiterate some of those comments. And I think what's he's touching on is that, you know, we talked earlier about how the industry has evolved and what we're seeing are more partners, you know. In 2008-2009, you know, we're starting to have Ball State involved in this, obviously what Doug is doing at the Humphrey School. I mean, we're getting so many more external partners that weren't there before. It used to be just the jurisdictions, and the jurisdictions, you know, shared amongst themselves. We had these kind of overarching organizations. But even, you know, the ICREAOTs and the Election Centers are getting to be more robust, Clearinghouses and exchanges of information, repositories. But, now that we see that the industry is indeed becoming an industry with more partners, there becomes other sources of this type of information. And I think that is something that the EAC can take advantage of, and again, relinquish some of the authorship. But, we love to see kind of the links and the things we look for, you know. When I'm doing research, I immediately want to see what someone else's election code says. So, that kind of link, like link me to Indiana's election code, so I can quickly pop in, without having to go down and drill down and search for it. Links to, again, to litigation, ongoing Court cases, those types of things, that it takes that kind of high level overview of the whole United States, to say what's going on in these states. But, again, we're having more and more partners to work with us, and this is a new development and a really beneficial development.

DR. KING:

So, perhaps a part of the Clearinghouse function will be to serve as a portal to other complementary agencies and organizations that have related data, resources.

Any other suggestions to the EAC for prioritizing or expanding the role of the Clearinghouse? Joe?

DR. LOSCO:

Of course, we all want the EAC to expand in our own areas, but I've mentioned things like greater access to advisories. I'd also like to see some -- we talked about costs, literally, cost data comparisons of, what does it take for a state to certify a system? What are the true costs involved? What do the states ask? I know there have been attempts to collect that data in the past and share them, but they've not been totally completed. And then, there are areas like ECOs where, in fact, some states charge for ECO certification and approval, other states don't. That kind of information, certainly, would allow the states to plot their future course in a more realistic way. And we're dealing, as far as the advisories, with a national market of voting equipment. And so, we all should be sharing in that data.

DR. KING:

Yeah, I think Joe, your observation that every manager in every organization asks the question at one time or another, "Who else is doing this and what's their experience been?" And I think recognizing that, in its application in voting and elections, is an important observation.

All right, I've got my eye on the clock, and as always we will end on time, and to that end, then, I'd like to begin by asking for the

members of the panel to kind of summarize what they heard here today, what their takeaways are. I think, when you sit through a three-and-a-half hour discussion, it's important that each of us kind of share what we heard, what we're going to take back to the office, what's on our to-do list that we heard here, today. And I always do this in reverse order, and so Ernie, you're going to start, and we're going to work our way around the table in this direction. And if you would, what are your takeaways?

MR. McCLELLAN:

Well, I think I've got a list of them a mile long, but I think the most important one is probably that transfer of ownership and increasing of engagement in the field, you know, providing that feeling of ownership of this information to the people who are actually out there doing that work. And we've all talked about a lot of different ways that we can try to do that. But, I think that, to me, is the most important thing that we could do to ensure that the information and this gathering of information continues to exist, and go on and continue in the future.

So, when I get back, you know, what I'm sitting here thinking about is, you know, how do I, in my office, better convey the importance of these materials, or better convey the importance of our participation in data collection effort, or if it's updating guidelines or, whatever it is, how do I convey the importance of our folks actually engaging in that process.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you Ernie. Joe?

DR. LOSCO:

I think my biggest takeaway is that EAC continues to play a vital role in collecting information, disseminating it. Some areas may be more important than others. Some areas are certainly changing.

In terms of new developments, I've heard a lot of talk about the importance of community building. I agree. I think building bridges among states who deliver similar services is very important. And what I'll do when I get home is to redouble my efforts to bring together those who do election certification, so that we can continue to meet, and also, then interact with the EAC.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you Joe. Barbara?

MS. DUNMORE:

Yes, what I'm taking away today is that the EAC still is valuable and the Clearinghouse still needs to exist. However, that morphs into something else, whether it's with partnerships that we have links to on there, or it's community building, but it needs to stay fresh and advancing. We need to continue to recognize that we now are an industry and have the focus on the industry. And in addition, the – basically, as Karen spoke about the succession planning, or how do we bring the newcomers in the field up to speed, and these newcomers are going to come with a new set of skills, as Doug mentioned, with the tweeting and the Facebooking, et cetera. And how is that all incorporated into our industry and what role can the EAC play in that?

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you Barbara. Steve.

MR. MORENO:

Well again, I would like to say thank you to the EAC for the invitation. It was a great discussion here, and a lot of the answers to the questions that were being asked, I appreciate hearing all the comments.

But, as we know, with the Clearinghouse information that's gathered, this is not a one-size-fits all for all the jurisdictions throughout this country, but that we need to, maybe, have some more of the partnerships. And thinking about some of the comments that I think Barbara had mentioned, maybe some ambassadors from within our states to work with the EAC. It is a tremendous amount of work that the EAC has put together in gathering this information to share with the nation in our conceptions of our elections. And I just appreciate all the work that they've put into it, and I definitely will want to continue to share with those that I'm involved with. I think Brian had mentioned 20 percent of the folks that are involved with IACREOT, Election Center and other organizations, such as that, and 70 -- 20 -- 80 percent or 70 percent are not able to have the capability of the resources to participate in it.

But, again, thank you for the invitation today, I appreciate it.

DR. KING:

Thank you. I'm going to go with Brian, and then we'll skip to Karen, and then we're going to work our way down.

MR. HANCOCK:

Thanks Merle. Again, from our perspective, I think it's just important that we continue to explore various ways to see what information is most important to state and local election officials,

and on the flipside, how we can better get that out to the people that need it most. In fact, the people that we were just talking about here, the folks that aren't often participating in the state and national conferences, but perhaps need it more than anybody else. So, those are my two big takeaways.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you Brian. Karen?

MS. LYNN-DYSON:

I think just better connective tissue, you know. How do we make that happen. And, you know, I just hope that, actually, the conversation will continue, and we could do some one-on-one conversations with folks, you know, feed me your ideas and, you know, bring them all on, and we'll piece it altogether and see what's reasonable and realistic, and what, maybe, isn't.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you Karen. Doug?

MR. CHAPIN:

Yeah, I think today makes it clear that the field needs this data, the field wants this data. But, I think the field needs to understand that this has to become more something that we do for ourselves and not something that's done for us. And I know that the current debate about the agency and the future of HAVA has been uncomfortable, but I think in many ways it's been a wakeup call for the profession that in just a decade there's some things about the EAC we've taken for granted. To the extent that we want this data sharing and this information sharing to continue, we're going to have to find a way to work with the agency and with the community

to make sure that whatever happens here in Washington that the good work that was started here continues for the benefit of the profession. And I continue -- I will bang that drum.

DR. KING:

All right, thank you Doug. Tammy?

MS. PATRICK:

Well, I started in elections in 2003, so the EMG Guides, the Quick Start Guides, those have been around my whole career in this profession, much like Ernie. And I can't fathom -- when I first came into the profession, you know, we all speak a whole different language with all of our acronyms, and the UOCAVA, NVRA, and all of the things that you have to get up to speed on, what does EV stand for, and everything else. And then, to go into, how do you apply that, how do you do a universal application of an election that is transparent, that is accessible to everyone who is eligible to participate, but precludes those from participating who are not eligible, how do you go about all these things? And I think about people coming into the field in the future, and I certainly hope that as we move forward the agency continues its robust involvement, and that it doesn't get shelved and put aside as though it's not necessary, because it is a vital role, I think, in the electoral process of our country.

So, I thank you all for allowing me to come today.

DR. KING:

Thank you, thank you Tammy. Jackie?

MS. HARRIS:

I think what I take from today is an understanding that obviously we're all trying to build a community, and that community has partners in it and EAC is one of those key partners. Brian made a comment earlier that we now need to work smarter, and that's very important for all of us. So, whether it's this standardization of data collection so that things come through and you don't have to sift through as much, or of it's using the longitudinal data that's now available to us to look at trends. We need to use the tools available to us and obviously, EAC provides us with enumerable tools to do our job from day to day. And we need that. So, I think coming back is going to find a way to incorporate all the tools that are available to us, and kind of spread the word and make sure that everyone understands that these are out there and that we're not kind of working alone, we're working together in partnership with people across the country, you know, from the top, all the way down to the smallest jurisdiction. And I think that's going to serve us all in the end.

And I thank you for letting me be here today.

DR. KING:

Okay, thank you Jackie. Tom.

MR. WILKEY:

Well, certainly I've taken away from this discussion today, I'm very grateful that they continue to do these and that you were available to, again, lead us through another one.

But, I take away a lot of pride in what we've been able to accomplish here. It is exactly what we started out to do, and it was in spite of a lot of stuff that was thrown in our way. Along the way,

you know, in addition to this kind of work, if you look at the history of EAC, the first two or three years, we didn't even have a budget, those three years. We didn't really get started on the path to begin to develop this kind of information until mid 2004, early 2005. And during that period of time, we had to use a lot of time, a lot of resources, a lot of staff time, just to become a real federal agency. If we started right now to talk about all of the various rules, regulations, procedures, and everything else, that we, as a small federal agency, had to meet, we could spend the rest of the entire afternoon, and probably tomorrow, talking about those things. We did it. All of those things are in place now. And in spite of it, and in spite of many of the stuff that was -- the nails that were thrown in our path, we managed -- EAC managed, these people managed to do an incredible amount of work for election officials throughout this country.

I have no doubt that it can continue. It may not be with the staff size or with the resources that they've had in the past, but the base is there. The base can continue. But, it needs that hands-on daily ability. It needs people that are well versed in elections. And another thing that most people on the outside never understood was it wasn't just a bunch of people working for the Federal Government. Many of our -- the staff here at EAC are former election officials, and have been in the field, and know what it's like, and brought a lot to the table. That needs to continue and it can continue. It can continue and the base is done and the hard work is done. It's just maintaining it, and, yes, building those kinds of

relationships, because that's the way it's got to be done in the future.

DR. KING:

Thank you, Tom. To all of the folks who have joined us on the webcast today, thank you for your participation. I'll remind you that there are presentations that will be linked to the website. And with every roundtable that we do here at the EAC, it's really just the first conversation in an ongoing discussion about that topic. And so, I will encourage all of you at the table, as well as those that may be watching on the webcast, to continue to interact with the EAC on these topics. And I think we heard some things today that will be going forward that will involve many of our existing, and many new stakeholders perhaps, to election administration in the United States.

I want to thank a couple of people, particularly, who make this work up here go very easily, Bryan Whitener, Jess Myers, Darcy, Emily Jones, without whom none of us could travel. We thank Emily so much for that. And, I think, also a nod to Jeannie Layson, the former Communications Officer, here at the EAC, who was very instrumental in the development of the website model. And then, to all of the EAC staffers, thank you so much for making this happen. And to the participants today, thank you for coming, thank you for coming prepared and joining us in this conversation. And safe travels to you as you return home.

And with that, I'll adjourn the roundtable. Thank you.

[The United States Election Assistance Commission (EAC) Clearinghouse
Roundtable Discussion adjourned at 12:30 p.m.]

bw/ad