



League of Women Voters of Utah

The Utah Voter

3804 Highland Drive, Suite 8-D, Salt Lake City UT 84106
(801)272-8683, FAX (801)272-5942, email: lwvut@mail.xmission.com, Web: www.lwvutah.com

Volume 73 Fall 2004 Issue 3

The League of Women Voters of Utah is a non-partisan, community-based political organization that encourages the informed and active participation of citizens in government and influences public policy through education and advocacy.

Contents

President’s Letter	1
An Evaluation of Major Election Methods	5
Department of Corrections Study Update: Volunteers Needed!	7
Nuclear News:	8
Voting Equipment	8
Voter Service: The Voter Guide	11
Legislative Update	12

President’s Letter



For the first time, the League of Women Voters of Utah plans to use the web to disseminate voter information. Modern technology has advanced at such a rapid pace that the league wants to take advantage of the opportunity we have with our new web site (www.lwvutah.org) to provide extensive election information to the voting population of Utah for this presidential election. We still plan to prepare a ‘written’ or hardcopy VOTER GUIDE to cover the United States Senate and House races and state wide elections including that of governor and the State School Board. We will print copies for all local leagues to distribute in their communities in locations where access to the web is not always available.

This summer the league owes it’s thanks to the Voter Service team, headed by Nancy Wingelaar, Sharon Walkington, Joyce Barnes and all the local league voter service chairs who have spent the summer corresponding with candidates in preparation for our LWV-Utah VOTER GUIDE. By October 1st both you and the

public will have the opportunity to go on-line at www.lwvutah.org and find candidate responses to league questions.

In anticipation of the exposure the league will receive with the on-line VOTER GUIDE, the state league has been re-designing our web-site. Pat Comarell, the web team chair along with the web team and '444 design' are in the process of creating a new, professional and more information-friendly web site. The new banner for our website is the header for this Voter. The web team plans to have all the information uploaded and accessible to the public by October 1st.

This is a remarkable opportunity for league visibility in Utah. We have a product in which the voting public will be highly interested. We need to provide, along with this information, the opportunity for members of the community to learn about the league, what it stands for and provide the opportunity to become a member. Please share our web address with your friends and neighbors, encouraging everyone to take the time to be an educated voter in November.

With the same intent of spreading the word to vote, I have saved this wonderful email which was sent to me many months ago by Gigi Brandt, LWV-SL Voter Editor. I hope that it will move you as it moved me. I plan to send it to my friends the last week in October, encouraging them to vote.

Remember how women got the right to vote:

The women were innocent and defenseless. And by the end of the night, they were barely alive. Forty prison guards wielding clubs and their warden's blessing went on a rampage against the 33 helpless women wrongly convicted of "obstructing sidewalk traffic."

They beat Lucy Burn, chained her hands to the cell bars above her head and left her hanging for the night, bleeding and gasping for air. They hurled Dora Lewis into a dark cell, smashed her head against an iron bed and knocked her out cold. Her cellmate, Alice Cosu, thought Lewis was dead and suffered a heart attack. Additional affidavits describe the guards grabbing, dragging, beating, choking, slamming, pinching, twisting and kicking the women.

Thus unfolded the "Night of Terror" on Nov.15, 1917, when the warden at the Occoquan Workhouse in Virginia ordered his guards to teach a lesson to the suffragists imprisoned there because they dared to picket Woodrow Wilson's White House for the right to vote.

For weeks, the women's only water came from an open pail. Their food--all of it colorless slop--was infested with worms. When one of the leaders, Alice Paul, embarked on a hunger strike, they tied her to a chair, forced a tube down her

throat and poured liquid into her until she vomited. She was tortured like this for weeks until word was smuggled out to the press.

So, refresh my memory. Some women won't vote this year because--why, exactly?

- ◆ We have carpool duties?
- ◆ We have to get to work?
- ◆ Our vote doesn't matter?
- ◆ It's raining?

Last week, I went to a sparsely attended screening of HBO's new movie "Iron Jawed Angels." It is a graphic depiction of the battle these women waged so that I could pull the curtain at the polling booth and have my say. I am ashamed to say I needed the reminder. There was a time when I knew these women well. I met them in college--not in my required American history courses, which barely mentioned them, but in women's history class. That's where I found the irrepressibly brave Alice Paul. Her large, brooding eyes seemed fixed on my own as she stared out from the page. *Remember*, she silently beckoned. *Remember*.

I thought I always would. I registered voters throughout college and law school, worked on congressional and presidential campaigns until I started writing for newspapers. When Geraldine Ferraro ran for vice president, I took my 9-year-old son to meet her. "My knees are shaking," he whispered after shaking her hand. "I'm never going to wash this hand again."

All these years later, voter registration is still my passion. But the actual act of voting had become less personal for me, more rote. Frankly, voting often felt more like an obligation than a privilege. Sometimes, it was even inconvenient. My friend Wendy, who is my age and studied women's history, saw the HBO movie, too. When she stopped by my desk to talk about it, she looked angry. She was. With herself.

"One thought kept coming back to me as I watched that movie," she said. "What would those women think of the way I use--or don't use--my right to vote? All of us take it for granted now, not just younger women, but those of us who did seek to learn." "The right to vote," she said, "had become valuable to her all over again."

HBO will run the movie periodically before releasing it on video and DVD.

I wish all history, social studies and government teachers would include the movie in their curriculum. I want it shown on Bunko night, too, and anywhere else women gather. I realize this isn't our usual idea of socializing, but we are not voting in the numbers that we should be, and I think a little shock therapy is

in order. It is jarring to watch Woodrow Wilson and his cronies try to persuade a psychiatrist to declare Alice Paul insane so that she could be permanently institutionalized. And it is inspiring to watch the doctor refuse. Alice Paul was strong, he said, and brave. That didn't make her crazy. The doctor admonished the men: ***"Courage in women is often mistaken for insanity."***

Here is some history:

1913 - Alice Paul and Lucy Burns organize a major suffrage parade in Washington, D.C. with over 5,000 women attending. The mistreatment of the marchers by the crowd and the police led to a great public outcry and the event was a media coup for the suffragists.

1916 -NAWSA (National American Women Suffrage Association) president Carrie Chapman Catt unveils her "winning plan" for suffrage victory at a convention in Atlantic City, New Jersey. It involved efforts to gain suffrage in a state-by-state fashion. Alice Paul splits with NAWSA in disagreement over this position and founds the National Woman's Party (NWP) setting out to win a national suffrage amendment by targeting Congress and the White House with a strategy of sustained, dramatic, nonviolent protest.

1917 -National Woman's Party stations daily pickets at the White House in civil disobedience campaign.

1918 to 1920 - The Great War (World War I) intervenes to slow down the suffrage campaign as some--but not all--suffragists decide to shelve their suffrage activism in favor of "war work." Alice Paul and the NWP stage daily pickets and many women are arrested at the White House.

August 26, 1920 - The Nineteenth Amendment is ratified. Its victory accomplished, NAWSA ceases to exist, but its organization becomes the nucleus of the League of Women Voters

1923 - The National Woman's Party first proposes the Equal Rights Amendment to eliminate discrimination on the basis of gender. It has never been ratified.

HERE IS THE STATUS OF WOMEN VOTING TODAY:

(for more info go to www.wvvv.org Women Voices Women Vote)

- Fact: 22 Million unmarried women who were eligible to vote did not cast ballots in the election in 2000.
- Fact: 16 million unmarried women were not registered to vote in 2000.
- Fact: 56% of all women not registered to vote are unmarried.

- Fact: 46% of all voting-age women are unmarried.
- Fact: If unmarried women voted at the same rate as married women, over six million more voters would have gone to the polls in 2000.

U.S. Census data and a nationwide survey reveal the following about unmarried women:

- Unmarried women comprise the largest group of unregistered and non-voting citizens in the United States.
- More than any other demographic group, unmarried women describe themselves as progressive, and desire government that responds to their concerns, specifically about jobs, health care, education, and a woman's right to choose. Unmarried women overwhelmingly believe that the country is headed in the wrong direction-and don't think politicians will do anything about it.
- Unmarried women who are not registered or who do not vote share similar values and priorities to their voting counterparts.
- Young women on their own can transform American politics.

Nanette Benowitz

An Evaluation of Major Election Methods

Salt Lake League members, please note, you may have read some of this information in a previous SL Voter.

We will be studying election methods this season. It is a large and important topic. Hopefully, it will not seem even more critical after the fall election but history does seem to be teaching us that our plurality, winner take all system is not working well either in the United States or other parts of the world.

I am very grateful to three individuals who are reading election methods studies from other Leagues in hopes that we can borrow one. They are Catherine New, Alice Steiner, and Liesa Manuel. Unfortunately the studies are long and there is a trade off between length and the need for information. We will persist in the face of these difficulties. This is just the kind of intellectual pursuit that League members enjoy and certainly it is our duty to understand all the issues around voting. Most of all we will have a very good time. I invite any members who would like some heavy reading to join the core group of policy wonks. After having read two League studies and numerous articles, I suggest we start with a discussion of what we think is right and wrong with our current elections. Remember we are talking about how we express our preferences and allocate representation.

We will look at instant run-off voting (IRV) methods first because they are simpler. The object is to elect winners by a true majority (50% plus 1) in contests where there will be only one person elected for example presidents,

mayors, legislators from districts with a single representative. What the voter does is list the candidates in order of preference. If there is no majority winner when all the first choices are counted, the candidate with the lowest count is dropped and the second choices of those who put the last place finisher first are counted instead. This process can be repeated if no majority candidate emerges from the second round. Others allocate points. One system can take into account how candidates rank in preference to others below the level of first choice in order to see which candidate the most voters prefer. Keep in mind this is all easy for a computer. If all is not clear League members will be able to participate in a demonstration that will explain all. These all can, on occasion, lead to an incorrect result. We will have an interesting time learning about them.

The other aspect of voting we will study is proportional voting. This is a method for selecting at large representatives within a multi-representative district. The core idea is that representatives are allocated blocs of voters of like mind according to their percent of the votes cast. In 1947 New York City had a system that resulted in a city council of 12 Democrats, 5 Republicans, 2 Liberals, and 2 Laborites. New York along with several other cities was using a sophisticated system called Single Transfer Vote (STV). STV resulted in some interesting but often unpopular minority representation and tended to disappear during the Cold War.

A (LWV) Washington State study gives a helpful summary of the history of election methods both in the U.S. and abroad and use their own state as an example of the pitfalls of the winner take all single representative district. Washington has nine congressional representatives. Voters are fairly evenly split between Democrats and Republicans from one election to another. However, the congressional delegation seldom reflects this statewide voter balance. In 1992, Democrats won 8 of 9 seats with 56% of the popular vote. In 1994 Republicans won 7 of 9 with 51%, in 1996 Republicans won 6 of 9 with 47% of the popular vote, and in 1998 Democrats won 5 of 9 with 57% - the only reasonable allocation if one is thinking of Washington voters as a whole not district by district. What this all means is that about half of Washington voters are under represented in Congress. The Washington situation should intrigue us since their near 50:50 split between the two major parties does not result in a balanced delegation in Washington DC. One could argue that our 2 Republicans to 1 Democrat is much more representative of our state as a whole. It probably should come as no surprise that the Washington State LWV is in favor of proportional representation. If you don't know why, this study will be your opportunity to learn.

There is, of course, another way to look at Washington politics. Perhaps there are local or even national issues that are more important than political philosophy. Eastern Washington grows a lot of apples. I would guess that apple

farmers were enthusiastic supporters of any candidate who favored NAFTA regardless of her party affiliation. Here in Utah the opinions on nuclear waste issues can be quite independent of party affiliation.

If you want to read all or parts of the Washington study go to www.lwwwa.org, click on Publications, then Guides and Studies where you will find *An Evaluation of Major Election Methods, 2000*.

It would be very helpful to have a representative in each local league to shepherd their league through this study. There is no hurry and no prescribed method of study. The LWWUT will deliver the material, use it as you wish. The only possible goal would be to be able to go to the next national convention with either a position of our own or with a request for a national study. Other Leagues will be going in this direction.

You might wonder why this election methods study is not a LWWUS project. There was an attempt to make it so at the Convention in June but it failed. The foremost problem is money, and secondly, prioritization. Unfortunately, the LWWUS is struggling with mounting national studies. It may be that in the future Local and State Leagues will coordinate among themselves to produce studies for the National League. What LWWUT is doing with election systems is somewhat of a trial balloon. – Ann O'Connell

Department of Corrections Study Update: Volunteers Needed!

I am looking for a couple of volunteers to update our "Department of Corrections Study (for Adults)" completed four years ago. Several issues have been in the news recently that deserve our attention including: the need for a facility to house women; serious talk about building a private prison on the Draper site and rehabilitation for non-violent offenders. Women comprise the fastest growing segment of the prison population; a facility for women was part of our League consensus. "Privatization" was not looked at favorably by League members. Requests for proposals have been solicited and three bids received from private companies. However several other interesting options are being considered by Correction Administrators that deserve exploration. Last Spring, Sen. Buttars introduced SB 21, called the "Drug Offenders Reform Act". This bill proposed rehabilitation programs for non-violent offenders instead of incarceration. It would be cost-effective in the long run but required large initial funding. It was very favorably endorsed by the Interim Committee and by the League, but legislators did not agree on such appropriation or on assigning new fees. They promised to bring it back in 2005.

What would this update require? First, a planning meeting in the fall. Next, 2 to 4 interviews with: Ed Mc Conkie, Executive Director of the Committee on Criminal

and Juvenile Justice (CCJJ), the Executive Director of Corrections and/or the Director in charge of "Women" in prison, and perhaps Sen. Buttars. These interviews should be conducted shortly after the November elections. Finally an article will be prepared for the January Voter.

If you are interested in participating or just want more info, please send an e-mail to Reva Servoss (ebvu94a@hotmail.com) or give her a call (801) 486-8839.

Nuclear News:

On August 16, 2004 the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission gave the Utah Dept of Environmental Quality (DEQ) authority (primacy) over Utah uranium mills and tailings. The facilities now under state oversight are Envirocare in Tooele County and the uranium mill at International Uranium Corporation in Blanding. DEQ has the authority to oversee the final uranium mill decommissioning and reclamation of sites at Shooting Canyon near Ticaboo and Rio Algom in Lisbon Valley (between Monticello & Moab). The US Dept of Energy still has responsibility for the clean up of the Atlas site at Moab.

The Performance Audit of the DEQ (by Office of Legislative Auditor General) found that regulatory oversight appears to adequately follow safeguards for the health and safety of Utahns. However, the Audit pointed out some questionable operating procedures and accessibility of information that may limit the program's effectiveness.

"Will the taxpayers get 'stuck' with paying the costs of closing and monitoring the various privately-owned Hazardous and Nuclear Waste sites in UT?" was the topic for Task Force at its August meeting. How League-like!

Final Task Force report will be presented in early November. Look for our study in the Spring VOTER. – Marelynn Zipser

Voting Equipment

Statement by the League of Women Voters of Utah, Sandy Peck, Executive Director, For the Utah Voting Equipment Selection Committee - August 12, 2004

My name is Sandy Peck, Executive Director of the League of Women Voters of Utah. A League principle nationwide is to protect every citizen in the right to vote. We think of the right to vote as the great equalizer which gives every citizen equal power, regardless of health or wealth or station in life. We have a long history of expanding that right to women, minorities, and people with disabilities. We know that today in Afghanistan, and no doubt, in other countries, citizens are being killed simply for asking their fellow countrymen to

register to vote. The same thing happened in our own American South not too many years ago. A secure voting process is a vital issue for our democracy.

As a League member I have had two recent opportunities to learn about voting systems, probably more than most people really want to know. I was a member of the State Plan Committee to implement HAVA, the Help America Vote Act. That committee included county clerks, familiar with the practicalities of running an election, including costs of purchasing, protecting, storing, and transporting equipment. Clerks are represented on the Equipment Selection Committee as well.

A wise decision was to use the same equipment statewide. This not only allows less costly bulk purchases but avoids some of the problems California has experienced with uncertified equipment, where every county has been on its own and depended on vendors rather than elected officials for guidance. The State Plan Committee also brought equipment vendors to the State Capitol to demonstrate their equipment, which gave us valuable hands-on information about what to look for before purchasing.

Most recently this June, as a delegate to the League of Women Voters of the United States Convention, I was educated after days of caucusing and floor discussion on the issue of whether the League should require voting systems to have what's called a Voter Verified Paper Trail, that is a printed record of every vote.

The Minnesota League said yes. They supported a Voter Verified Paper Trail--ballot generators that combine the accessibility of voting by touch screens and earphones with printed ballots that are fed into an optical scanner to be counted and kept for recount purposes. Their research showed that such a system was acceptable to voters with disabilities and that ballot generators would cost *less* than computers alone

The Georgia League said no. After two years experience with DRE's, they found that 70 percent of the voters liked using them and results were more accurate. DRE's did not allow overvotes - that is accidentally invalidating one's vote by voting twice for the same office- and reduced undervotes - failure to vote for a particular office--from about 5% in 1998 to 1% in 2002. They pointed to security features such as redundant recording of votes and number of voters who cast ballots in three places and the fact that paper records could be produced by DREs at the end of the day. They said combining computers with ballot generators would cost *more* than computers alone.

As we pondered all this, two things became clear. First, no matter what system is used, security is needed. Otherwise paper ballots can be lost or miscounted

and computer code can be tampered with. Second, printouts from computers that voters can inspect do not guarantee that votes are being counted as the voter intended. If a DRE can be programmed to *record* a vote incorrectly, it can also be programmed to *print* a misleading confirmation. This was particularly frustrating.

As a result, because of the complexity and constantly changing nature of technology, a new League Citizen's Right to Vote position was approved which moved from taking a stand on any particular type of technology - be it touch screen voting, optical scanners or a paper trail- to taking a stand on the goals or principles *any* technology must meet.

The new position reads "In order to ensure integrity and voter confidence in elections the LWVUS supports the implementation of voting systems and procedures that are (1) secure; (2) accurate; (3) recountable; and (4) accessible." These standards should be applied to any voting technology.

(1) A secure system should be protected from outside tampering and system failure that could wipe out results. Secure computerized systems are a particular concern of many at this hearing today. Some suggested solutions include physically isolating all voting equipment, redundancy in systems and procedures, and staying off the Internet, where opportunities for hacking abound. Testing of equipment in mock elections and parallel testing on Election Day have been suggested as well. In Georgia, the state funds a specialized technical center, the Center for Election Systems at Kennesaw State University staffed by computer science professionals to research secure voting technologies, which might be a model for Utah. Meanwhile we urge the Committee to address citizen fears of black box voting by finding ways to interpret these issues to the general public and give voters' confidence that the system works.

(2) An accurate system should record every vote as it is cast by each voter. DREs allow voters to review a summary of their choices and make corrections before pushing the "final button." This allows the "second chance voting" required by HAVA. The issue is how both election officials and voters can be sure that vote is accurately recorded and counted.

(3) A recountable system was uppermost in League minds at our convention. We are very aware that just one vote can change the outcome of an election and recounts must be available. The question is whether paper records, and what kind of paper records are needed to meet that standard.

(4) Accessibility. We have a major opportunity to increase voting privacy and accessibility for citizens with disabilities, limited English proficiency, and literacy

challenges by use of equipment that allows larger print, ballots in languages other than English, and headphones.

We commend the Voting Equipment Selection Committee for adhering to standards that are the same or similar to those of the League in Utah's Request for Proposal to voting equipment vendors. Thank you for your hard work and for the opportunity to share our thoughts on voting equipment systems in this public hearing. Please call on us if we can be of assistance.

Voter Service: The Voter Guide

The State League Voter Service Committee is busy putting together our first online Voter Guide. Following what National is doing with their Voter Guide site, we are striving to make our site the "One-Stop Information Shop for your candidates, your issues, your decision". Going on line with our Guide will bring us into the "new information age" with more accessible, more current, and more extensive information all for less expense. We are currently collecting information from candidates, developing the website, and entering candidate information. Each Local League has been asked to send questions to their candidates for the State Legislature and any other candidates for local office they wish to include. (If you would like to help, contact your local President or Voter Service Chair.)

Our target date for launching the website is SEPT. 19th when we will begin "womaning" a booth with voter information at the New Salt Lake City Library. There will be press releases, and lots of promotion for the site and we hope to make it a "MUST READ" for the election. The website is www.lwvutah.org and will be linked to the National website at www.congress.org and the KUED website www.VoteUtah.org. These sites should make gathering information on voting, candidates, issues, and the election EASY for us and the public. PLEASE BE A PR PERSON FOR THESE SITES! We need exposure, exposure, exposure! Please promote these sites by word of mouth, use of the media, and by including the web addresses on any piece of literature you pass out. You will be doing yourself, your friends, and our democracy a service by sharing and using these sites. Let's each try to make it a goal to share these websites with 20 other people.

What will be in the Voter Guide? As in other years, we will include general voter information, registration dates, debate dates, county clerk information, advice on how to watch a debate and judge a candidate, how to find your district, biographical information about the candidates, their responses to our questions, and much more. We have included candidates for Congressional office, State wide office, the State Legislative office, State School Board, and some City, County, and Local School Board offices. We may print a hard copy Voter Guide (a function of human and financial resources) which, if printed, will be made

available to Local Leagues for distribution to libraries, schools, senior citizen centers and wherever you see fit. However, we are moving away from this form of Voter Guide toward the more accessible online Voter Guide.

Your Voter Service Committee has generated some probing questions for candidates. For example, the candidates for State Legislature were asked:

1. What is the role of the legislature in balancing the need for economic development for a growing population with demands for conservation of natural resources such as water, air, open space, and wilderness?
2. What two major goals do you have for the upcoming legislative session?
3. Discuss possible income tax reforms that would increase funding for education by about \$80 million a year. Include:
 - A. Expand and index income brackets
 - B. Phase out 50 percent federal deductibility
 - C. Gradually eliminate personal exemptions beyond four per family

Do you support all, some or none of these suggestions? Why or why not?
Are there
Other reforms you would suggest?

Sound like interesting reading? Go to www.lwvutah.org to find out their response and much more. And don't miss www.congress.org and www.VoteUtah.org.

Legislative Update

The Legislature is getting back to work. They took a July break to host their fellow lawmakers during the National Counsel of State Legislators Convention here in Salt Lake City.

Law Enforcement & Criminal Justice Interim Committee

A new Asset Forfeiture law took effect on July 1, 2004. Under the law, proceeds from assets collected by state law enforcement no longer go directly to the arresting agency but into a Crime Reduction Fund. The proceeds may not be used for salaries or retirement, but may go for specific project grants.

The provisions in forfeiture law apply to drug crimes. Other kinds of crimes have their own relevant penalties. Small amounts of drugs (personal use) are exempted. Similar provisions for poachers exist. Clear and convincing evidence is the standard and the law requires that the plaintiff prove seizure is meritorious. If property is seized, there must be:

- Actionable goods (something to seize)
- Facilitation (purpose is to engage in an illegal act)

- Notice (that something is being seized). A seized house cannot dispossess the owner without adequate notice.

Whether the crime is federal or state depends on severity of the crime, not the amount of property. Eighty per cent of potential seizure cases go through the state and 20% to federal officers. If the owner is found not guilty, property is supposed to be restored if the owner files.

The committee met on August 18, with the purpose of demonstrating the efforts that the Attorney General's and SL County Attorney's offices are making to teach the new procedures to local law enforcement. Chad Platt, Deputy D.A., Salt Lake County, has developed a slide presentation and would probably be available to large groups. -Pat Nielson, Lobby Corps 583-6932

Government Operations Interim Committee, August 18, 2004

In spite of an effort on the part of the State Elections Office to proceed with appropriate haste while securing public input, there appears to be an increasing level of citizen discomfort over the timing behind and criteria for the new voting machines. Without a quorum present, the committee was unable to take any action, even adding the topic to the next meeting agenda, so the next steps are unclear.

Amy Naccarato, Director, State Elections Office, provided a summary for the committee on several topics, including Utah's response to the Help America Vote Act (HAVA).

Election process inconsistencies

- Inconsistencies between the bond election process and the regular election process regarding ballot preparation and absentee voting deadlines have recently been identified. These were a result of SB115 passed in the 2004 Legislative Session. The committee needs to reconcile the new law with the Utah Code in order to eliminate these inconsistencies.

Statewide registration database

- HAVA requires that there be a single, centralized uniform database by January 2006
- The State Elections Office is building this in-house.
- Four counties are already on the database and 12 will be added in January

Department of Justice

- Representatives from the U.S. DOJ visited Utah during the June primary and met with election judges at various polling sites. They provided

verbal feedback that the provisional ballot processes were not being administered consistently. This feedback has resulted in changes in the judges' training program.

Mail registration

- The mail registration process implemented in the June elections worked very well.

Statewide voting machines

- An RFP for new voting machines was released in July and two proposals have been received, one from Diebold and another from Election Systems and Software.
- The State Elections Office is reviewing both proposals and has not committed to either. They are targeting to make a decision in early December and will be evaluating input from:
 - Public hearings
 - A mock election to be held September 16-17
 - Assessments of November results from other states that have already implemented new equipment

Naccarato is concerned Utah is moving too slowly. If the machines are received in spring 2005, the timetable to put them in place and train personnel for the 2006 elections is very aggressive.

- Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail (VVPAT)
- The Elections Office has received feedback about incorporating this feature in the new machines. A. Naccarato indicated that she understood the concerns over computer security issues, along with the consumer perception of lack of voting security and indicated that the Office is trying to address these issues. She, however, is more concerned about human error (poorly trained election workers) than computing problems/hacking. She indicated that adding a VVPAT can be done, however there are poll worker issues that need to be addressed including high judge fallout, training issues, paper jams and paper changes, etc.
- Funding
 - Utah is eligible for \$28M and has received \$8.8M so far. Approximately \$16M should be coming, but A. Naccarato was unsure of the actual amount or the timing of this funding. She was also unsure that money above this \$24.8M would be forthcoming.
- Public Feedback
 - Naccarato indicated that there had been one public hearing so far and another coming up shortly. The overriding concern expressed in these hearings was around security issues.

Public Input

Gary Shea, a computer scientist in attendance had three concerns about the process the State Elections Office is following: timing, technology and transparency

- Timing –He felt that there was no need to rush, given upcoming revisions to the national election standards expected mid-2005 and the opportunity to assess

2004 election results from states having already implemented new voting machines. The technology is still in flux.

- Technology - 95% of computer professionals are concerned about DRE (paperless), which data suggest have a high error rate. He also indicated that voter verified ballots would probably be required eventually and it would be premature to order machines without this capability
- Transparency – He felt the RFP process had been closed and that the decision-making guidelines, while incorporating a scoring system, allowed too much discretion on the part of the selection committee.

Kathy Dopp, founder of www.utahcountvotes.org, also agreed that the process was proceeding too quickly

- No need to rush into a flawed election system
- Need to know who the RFP evaluators will be
- Don't pass up the opportunity to learn from the 2004 election results
- Utah has an opportunity to collaborate with a multi-state voting consortium that is promoting free, open source software vs. propriety software. Open source software is felt by some to be more secure than proprietary software.
- Waiting means that voting machines will be cheaper and better next summer
- County clerks want an extension from 2006 until 2008
- The vendor selection process is secret, as is the proposed recount process

The Disability Law Center supported the process the State Elections Office is using as well as their timing. Over 21 million Americans did not vote in the last election due to their disabilities. There are 250K Utahans with disabilities; it is unclear how many of these individuals have not voted in the past due to technology limitations.

Wrap up

Representative McGee was concerned that a committee quorum was lacking and requested that the topic be put on the committee's agenda again in September, but the presiding chairman said he could not speak for the chair. – Jessica Mathewson

If you'd like more information about legislative committee meetings, you can call 538-1032 or go to le.utah.gov.



League of Women Voters of Utah
3804 Highland Drive, #8D
Salt Lake City, UT 84106

www.lwvutah.org
phone 801.272.8683
Fax 801.272.5942
e-mail: LWVUT@mail.xmission.co

