

**Secretary of State Equipment Certification Advisory Committee**

(A.R.S. § 16-442)

1700 West Washington Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor

Phoenix, Arizona 85007 & Virtually via Zoom

(602) 542-8683 fax (602) 542-6172

**FINAL APPROVED COPY**

**Meeting Minutes of May 11, 2022**

**I. Call to Order**

Chairman Ken Matta, Information Security Officer, Secretary of State’s Office, called the meeting to order at 8:39 a.m.

**II. Welcome & Roll Call**

**Committee Members Present:**

Ken Matta - Chairman

Peter Silverman, ESQ.

Dr. Jim Helm

**Committee Staff Present:**

Kori Lorick – State Election Director & Staff

Christine Dyster – Deputy Election Director & Staff

Tanner Robinson – Senior Elections Specialist & Staff

Ryan Macias – Consultant & Founder at RSM Election Solutions LLC & Staff

Amy Chan – General Counsel

**Committee Members Absent:**

None

**Committee Staff Absent:**

None

Ms. Kori Lorick, State Election Director, Secretary of State’s Office, introduced the committee members and staff, noting Ms. Amy Chan as filling the General Counsel role vacated by Ms. Sambo Dul, and the Election Systems & Software (ES&S) staff present.

**III. Approval of Minutes from the March 2, 2022 Meeting.**

Chairman Matta Motioned for approval of the previous meeting minutes dated Mar. 2, 2022. Dr. Jim Helm, Program Chair, Arizona State University, seconded the motion, and the motion was carried unanimously.

**Votes:**

Chairman Matta: Yes

Mr. Silverman: Yes

Dr. Helm: Yes

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

N/A: 0

**IV. Review of Voting Equipment Application for Certification of the EVS 6.2.0.0 Voting System from ES&S.**

Chairman Matta noted this was a continuation of the March 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting test. He noted that added functionality was not programmed for the previous meeting that the committee wished to see and were asked to return and do a general election test of the equipment accordingly.

No comments from the committee.

**V. Presentation of the Script to be used for the test of the EVS 6.2.0.0 Voting System.**

Chairman Matta introduced the general election test to be done. He described that after the accessible and optical scan test was done, results would be compared to the Secretary of State's Offices' predetermined results. He said that the version number of the equipment would also be checked before beginning. The DS450 central count is 4.1.0.0. The DS200 precinct tabulators is 2.40.0.0. The ExpressVote accessible machines is 4.2.0.0. The ElectionWare software suite is 6.2.0.0. The versions were shown as correct.

**VI. Conduct Test of the ES&S EVS 6.2.0.0 Voting System.**

The general election test began at 8:49 a.m.

Chairman Matta noted the new functionality in connection with poll workers now having the ability to mark accessible ballots as provisional ballots. He noted that there is a square which can be filled in by the poll worker which will note the ballot as provisional. The test is done to ensure that the on-site tabulator would not accept a provisional ballot, since they are verified off-site from the polls, he explained.

Chairman Matta noted that his voting process of the accessible equipment went well. He said that the equipment does allow for the voter to confirm their votes prior to casting the ballot. He added that the machine read back the votes he cast, and marked them correctly.

Chairman Matta explained that Mr. Peter Silverman, Senior Counsel, Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP., was checking on the different types of write-in votes to be tested. He noted that both an illegitimate and legitimate write-in candidate would be tested for. This is so that electronic adjudication will assist in attributing votes correctly to official write-in candidates, rather than any written in candidate or other name, he continued. Chairman Matta stated that he inserted a fully voted provisional ballot into the machine, and his cast votes were accurately read back to him.

Chairman Matta said that the cast votes by the committee would then be reviewed for accuracy prior to the optical scan portion of the test. He noted that the votes were cast correctly on the accessible test ballots.

The accessible portion of the test was shown to have concluded successfully.

The optical scan portion of the test began at 9:26 a.m.

Chairman Matta noted that prior to tabulation, zero reports would be generated to confirm no votes were cast on the equipment before beginning the optical scan portion of the test. He noted that he would first be testing for the provisional ballot which was cast. The screen noted ballot not authorized, a review box may be marked. The machine correctly rejected the ballot.

Ms. Susan Paulson-Parmer, State Certification Manager, ES&S, asked whether the committee wished to see how the ballot would be accepted. Chairman Matta answered that this would be done later at central count. He noted that a provisional ballot would later be accepted following a standard procedure scenario where a provisional ballot is later verified by hand prior to tabulation.

Ms. Paulson-Parmer asked the Chairman if he wished to run a report after each batch of tabulated ballots. The Chairman declined.

Chairman Matta noted that over votes would also be tested for during ballot tabulation to determine if they would be correctly rejected by the equipment.

Ms. Lorick noted that this vendor is the only vendor the committee is working with for certification, the test was being done by the committee as prepared by the Secretary of State's Office, and that the committee is testing for accuracy on the equipment in order to recommend certification of the voting equipment in the state. She finished, stating that it has already been federally certified.

Chairman Matta noted that the tabulation results were then being uploaded into the election management system to be generated as a report to be compared to the pre-determined results. He requested to see electronic adjudication testing beforehand. He noted that some write-in votes would be tested in electronic adjudication. This is a process where a board would look at a write-in vote to determine if an official candidate was selected. He added that a voter intent test would also be done on two ballots during electronic adjudication, to determine the intent of a vote that was caught during tabulation for review.

Ms. Paulson-Parmer explained that the write-in module is used in election software to check write-in votes against a list of certified write-in candidates. She noted that a write-in candidate was listed and she correctly assigned it as an official candidate vote. There were some blank votes, and one additional vote for a candidate which did match a candidate on the official write-in candidate list. The write-in votes were then added to the results accordingly. Next, she also reviewed voter intent adjudication. The Chairman explained that the vendor found no clear marks on the first voter intent review, and the same on the subsequent ballot. No intent was shown on the next ballot, just an over vote. She noted that a voter had circled a selection on the next ballot instead of correctly marking it, and the vote was then attributed correctly; two votes total were given that intent was determined for. Chairman Matta noted that instead of filling in an oval, the selection was circled, which is why a ballot like this was captured for review during electronic adjudication. Ms. Paulson-Parmer continued, noting the next ballot was incorrectly voted for a judicial retention selection; she then attributed the votes correctly as determined by review. The next ballot contained an over vote, which was approved without changes to be noted in the results.

The results were then compared with the predetermined results.

The general election test was shown to have concluded correctly.

Dr. Helm agreed with the Chairman that the votes matched the pre-determined results accordingly, and the general election test concluded successfully.

The test concluded successfully at 10:10 a.m.

**VII. Call to the Public - Please note: the committee may not discuss items that are not on the agenda. Therefore, action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing study of the matter or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date. Public comments may be sent to [elections@azsos.gov](mailto:elections@azsos.gov), with the subject line: Equipment Certification, and will be read and included in the record. Comments are limited to 5 minutes per member of the public.**

Ms. Lorick requested a brief break in order for the Secretary of State's Office staff to conduct a comment review; comments may have been received.

The Chairman motioned to take a short break for comment review. Dr. Helm seconded the motion, and the motion was carried unanimously.

**Votes:**

Chairman Matta: Yes

Mr. Silverman: Yes

Dr. Helm: Yes

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

N/A: 0

The committee took a brief break at 10:14 a.m.

The committee reconvened at 10:22 a.m.

Ms. Lorick noted that Ms. Christine Dyster, Deputy Election Director, Secretary of State's Office, would be reading comments submitted via email and Zoom. There were 2 emails and comments submitted using an out-of-circulation link for an unrelated meeting from Zoom. They have been copied below directly from those sources.

**Comments Submitted via Email:**

From: ctorkko <[ctorkko@comcast.net](mailto:ctorkko@comcast.net)>

Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 9:21 AM

To: Elections <[elections@azsos.gov](mailto:elections@azsos.gov)>

Subject: Comments on equipment certification meeting May 11th

1. Volume of meeting is intermittent not allowing us to hear everything being said.
2. When the test was done on checking the audio response from the machine, I did not hear it. This means we had to take Ken's word for it.
3. It is important to feel confident that the program in the machine is not changing the vote.
4. You're testing needs to have volume, to prove to us that votes are not being programmed to change every so often and especially from any particular party.

Carol Torkko, Observer

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S7, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

From: TeriGgirl <[teriggirl@gmail.com](mailto:teriggirl@gmail.com)>

Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 10:19 AM

To: Elections <[elections@azsos.gov](mailto:elections@azsos.gov)>

Subject: Equipment certification

Committee:

This “public” hearing was a complete waste of time. No comments, questions allowed on the zoom. It’s not really a public forum. We could not hear, see, are truly know what the machines are doing and expected to just take your word for it. Where is the professionalism. The ballots being checked were even coerced and corrected when you were double checking.

ONE DAY  
ONE VOTE  
NO MACHINES  
VOTER ID  
NO MAIL-IN BALLOTS  
SMALLER PRECINCTS  
MAKE ELECTIONS FREE AND FAIR  
EASY TO VOTE, HARD TO CHEAT

Teri Grunewald  
602-684-1553

**Comments Submitted via Zoom:**

Are the machines being used the Dominion machines? Are they the same machines used previously or new ones? Patricia Porter

Only 1,923,719 ballots went into the machines but 2,089,563 came out. Thus, somewhere between scanned in and reported out 165,844 were created in the system. That is a 7.9% increase over the SOS Official canvass. Can you please explain this? Gail Golec

Provisional ballots are not counted. Now you are making it easier to make a ballot easier to not count? Gail Golec

<https://www.depernow.com/dominion.html> Did you see this video wherein the people put in a vote and then ballot count came out different than what was put into the machines? Gail Golec

99.36% of all batches scanned were modified. Total modifications show 470,734 individual modifications. We need to ban these machines. Hand count only! Gail Golec

Why did you turn off the switch that allowed for Non Vote Secure Paper during the election? Gail Golec

"So...are there machines from each county? Hard to see the machines...

and are you putting the ballot through each machine?" Inger Johnson

How is it that 147K ballots were still not counted at the time and the day that the election was certified, yet we miraculously came up with the exact number for Biden? Gail Golec

Computer issues so I'm on late. What is happening please? Pretty quiet! Gayle Peters

Why is it that Attorney Kory Langhofer is not allowing for the Paper Analysis audit be presented to the Senate? Doug Logan said the Paper Analysis was expected soon. It's here. You should see it. These machines need to be banned now! Gail Golec

The machines can be programmed to change the vote without you knowing it. Look at this video now. <https://www.depernelaw.com/dominion.html> Gail Golec

Why did you disable my ability to chat? Too much truth for you? Gail Golec

What do you have to say about the ability of these machines being able to be connected to the Internet. Gail Golec

This is a dog and pony show. Do you really believe we believe any of this? This only shows a machine can count. And it is pre-determined to do exactly what they want you to see. They can be programmed to do what ever they want. We must ban these machines! Gail Golec

We need smaller precincts with Voter ID and vote In person. Limited mail in ballots with notarized request for ballots. No more cheating centers and drop boxes. We will not let this stand. You will not get away with this again. Gail Golec

lost sound Carl Getz

Are you going to pretend like computers can not be manipulated? Every single state in this country has People who are complaining about the Election Fraud. Yet, you choose to pretend that the People are not aware that this is happening! The media can not and is not covering for you. We know! Gail Golec



Why haven't these machines been banned yet? We the people don't want them any more! Joe Forte

This just goes to show that we need full audits of the paper, because these machines can do whatever you program them to do. It's the paper that matters. For instance, why is it that in 61 batches of ballots, 58 batches had 90% Biden and 10% Trump and 3 of the batches had 90% Trump 10% Biden? That is statistically impossible. This information was provided on 9/20/24 by Forensic Document Analyst Erich Speckin and yet it was omitted from the official Audit report that Kory Langhofer submitted. Counterfeit ballots can be counted too as you can tell.

Gail Golec

The fact that we had the election certified before the ballots were even counted should be enough for you all to say enough is enough! Allowing these machines to count Our ballots are no less than treasonous, based upon the audit results alone. Gail Golec

I welcome a meeting with each and every one of you to share with you the proof of the information that I have provided to you today. Gail Golec

What machines are you using? Who calibrated them? What is the public access to observe and verify that the appropriate and neutral parties calibrated machines prior to the next election?

Ann Tex

In Colorado, the so called "trusted build" software deleted federally required data when installed. Also, there were additional SQL election databases created. We have over 1.2M files that were deleted and supposedly archived and never provided to the auditors. These too were adjudication databases that were deleted. Why does that not concern you? Gail Golec

Who are the "vendors"? Gayle Peters

What is criteria for rejecting a write in? Kimberly Burleson

this is a worthless demonstration. you you going to fix this for future events to that observers can actually see what's going on Jim Simpson

What would make AZ not want yo use the equipment? Inger Johnson

I heard you say you are testing ES&S...not Unisyn? Or any other? Inger Johnson

Are you going to test remote accessibility? Inger Johnson

You are checking these machines in a “vacuum” and only a couple of “sample machines. Which if they work are you making the assumption that all those particular machines used in AZ are “good”. Lynn Simpson

Can you clarify what a “certified candidate” means? Kimberly Burleson

### **VIII. Discussion & Recommendations Regarding the Certification of the ES&S EVS 6.2.0.0 Voting System.**

Chairman Matta motioned that the committee recommend to the Secretary of State to approve and certify the ES&S EVS 6.2.0.0 Voting System. Mr. Silverman seconded the motion.

Prior to a unanimous vote and roll call, Dr. Helm requested that the committee go into executive session. Chairman Matta seconded the motion, and the motion was carried unanimously.

#### **Votes:**

Chairman Matta: Yes

Mr. Silverman: Yes

Dr. Helm: Yes

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0  
N/A: 0

The committee exited regular session and entered executive session at 10:33 a.m.

The committee exited executive session and entered regular session at 10:40 a.m.

The committee continued where it left off. The previous motion was noted as unanimous.

**Votes:**

Chairman Matta: Yes  
Mr. Silverman: Yes  
Dr. Helm: Yes

Ayes: 3  
Nays: 0  
N/A: 0

**IX. Discussion of upcoming meetings and summary of upcoming events by Chair Ken Matta.**

The Chairman stated no upcoming meetings were currently scheduled and no events were set.

**X. Adjournment.**

Chairman Matta motioned that the committee meeting be adjourned. Mr. Silverman seconded the motion, and the motion was carried unanimously.

**Votes:**

Chairman Matta: Yes  
Mr. Silverman: Yes  
Dr. Helm: Yes

Ayes: 3  
Nays: 0  
N/A: 0

The meeting was adjourned at 10:43 a.m.