

San Francisco Elections Commission
2015 Annual Report

January 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015

Approved by the Commission on:

October 19, 2016

Commissioners as of December 31, 2015:

Christopher Jerdonek, President

Jill Rowe, Vice President

Roger Donaldson

Charles Jung

Dominic Paris

Rosabella Safont

Winnie Yu

Written by:

Christopher Jerdonek

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Overview
3. Meetings
4. People
5. Administration
6. Open Source Voting and Next Voting System
7. Open Data
8. November 3, 2015 Municipal Election
9. Annual Evaluation of Director
10. Appendices
11. Attachments

1. Introduction

This is the 2015 Annual Report of the San Francisco Elections Commission, prepared in accordance with the Bylaws of the Elections Commission:

ARTICLE IV. COMMISSION'S POWERS AND DUTIES.

M. The Commission shall prepare an annual report describing its activities and shall file such report with the Mayor and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors consistent with the Commission's duties under Section 4.103 of the San Francisco Charter and Sections 1.56 and 8.16 of the Administrative Code. This annual report shall cover the calendar year from January 1 through December 31.

See Appendix A for a copy of all sections of the Bylaws relating to the annual report.

Major themes for the Commission in 2015 were open source voting systems and open data. In addition, major Commission activities included the November 3, 2015 Municipal Election and the annual review of the Director of Elections.

The report is organized around these major topic areas, in addition to covering more routine topics like Commission membership and administrative information.

2. Overview

Below is a selection of notable events that occurred during the 2015 calendar year. Events related to Commission membership are included in Section 4.

| Date | Description |
|-------------|---|
| February 18 | The Commission adopts its first “Guidelines for Evaluation of Director of Elections.” |
| April 21 | First day for new Commission Secretary Nadya Hewitt. |
| April 23 | The Commission interviews three Department of Elections employees for the annual review of the Director of Elections. |
| May 20 | Joy Bonaguro, Chief Data Officer from the Office of the Mayor, presents on open data to the Commission. |
| June 17 | Jason Fried, Executive Officer of the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo), presents his draft report on open source voting systems to the Commission. |
| August 6 | The Department of Elections issues a Request for Information (RFI) for a new voting system. |
| August 28 | RFI responses due. |
| October 21 | The Commission holds a hearing on open source voting systems with five invited presenters. |
| October 23 | The San Francisco Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) releases its final report, “Study on Open Source Voting Systems.” |
| November 3 | November 3, 2015 Consolidated Municipal Election |
| November 18 | The Commission unanimously passes its “Open Source Voting Systems Resolution.” |

Table 1: Selected timeline of notable events

3. Meetings

This section includes information related to Commission meetings and membership during the 2015 calendar year.

Regular Commission meetings were on the third Wednesday of each month in Room 408 of San Francisco City Hall. Commission meetings averaged about two public commenters per meeting and ranged in length from about 40 minutes for the shortest meeting to 3 hours and 45 minutes

for the longest. The average length of all regular Commission meetings (excluding closed session portions) was about one hour and 40 minutes.

The Commission continued to have one committee, the three-member Budget and Oversight of Public Elections Committee (BOPEC). Regular BOPEC meetings were on the first Wednesday of each month in Room 421 of City Hall.

BOPEC met four times during the year. In February, it reviewed the Department's proposed budget. In June, it discussed both open source voting systems and the alternate election security plan for the November 2015 election. In August, it discussed the Election Plan for the November election. In December, it reviewed the November election.

4. People

4.1. Commissioners

The following two tables (Tables 2 and 3) list the Commission and BOPEC membership at the beginning of the 2015 calendar year. The table following these two tables (Table 4) lists membership changes that occurred during the course of the year. In addition, Attachment 1 includes a chart of meeting attendance for both the full Commission and BOPEC.

| Name | Position | Term Ends | Appointed By |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Richard Matthews | President | 1/2015 | City Attorney |
| Christopher Jerdonek | Vice President | 1/2019 | Board of Supervisors |
| Charles Jung | | 1/2018 | Mayor |
| Jill Rowe | | 1/2016 | Public Defender |
| Rosabella Safont | | 1/2019 | Treasurer |
| Winnie Yu | | 1/2017 | District Attorney |
| <i>Vacant</i> | | 1/2018 | Board of Education |

Table 2: Commission Membership as of January 1, 2015

| Name | Position |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| Christopher Jerdonek | Chairperson |
| Jill Rowe | |
| <i>Vacant</i> | |

Table 3: BOPEC Membership as of January 1, 2015

| Date | Description |
|-------------|--|
| January 21 | The Commission elected Commissioner Jerdonek President (succeeding President Matthews). |
| January 21 | The Commission elected Commissioner Rowe Vice President (succeeding Vice President Jerdonek). |
| February 18 | President Jerdonek named Commissioner Rowe BOPEC Chairperson (succeeding himself). |
| March 2 | Commissioner Matthews vacated the City Attorney seat after serving as a holdover for the maximum of 60 days after the end of his term. |
| March 6 | Dominic Paris assumed the Board of Education seat. |
| May 20 | President Jerdonek appointed Commissioner Paris to BOPEC (filling a vacancy). |
| October 21 | Roger Donaldson assumed the City Attorney seat. |
| December 16 | President Jerdonek appointed Commissioner Donaldson to BOPEC (replacing himself). |

Table 4: Timeline of Commission membership events

4.2 Other Individuals

John Arntz continued to lead the Department of Elections as the Director of Elections. Nadya Hewitt was hired as the new Commission Secretary in April and continued to serve through the end of the year. Joshua White served as Deputy City Attorney for the Commission, with Deputy City Attorney Andrew Shen occasionally filling in.

5. Administration

5.1. E-mail

This year the Commission President worked with the Director of Elections to give each Commissioner the option of receiving a San Francisco government (aka SFGov) e-mail address. These are e-mail addresses normally having the form First.Last@sfgov.org.

The government e-mail address is useful for sending and receiving Commission-related e-mails. In addition, it can be displayed on the Commission website and included on Commissioner business cards.

By the end of the year, six of the seven Commissioners had an SFGov e-mail address, and five of the seven chose to list their e-mail address next to their name on the “About” page of the Commission's website.

5.2. Website

In the summer and fall of 2014, the Commission made it more convenient for Commissioners and members of the public to find and access information about past and upcoming meetings.

Upcoming meetings are posted on the home page of the Commission website. Recent past meetings are listed in a single table on the “Meetings” page. Full Commission meetings and BOPEC meetings appear chronologically in the same list of meetings for convenience and greater visibility.

Links to the meeting agenda, agenda packet, minutes, and YouTube audio are all visible from the top-level list. Below is a screenshot of what this looks like on the Meetings page of the Commission website:

| | | | | |
|------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Wed, January 20, 2016 | Commission | Agenda Packet | Minutes | 1:41:22 (YT) |
| Wed, January 6, 2016 | BOPEC | No meeting | | |
| Wed, December 16, 2015 | Commission | Agenda Packet | Minutes | 1:09:41 (YT) |
| Wed, December 2, 2015 | BOPEC | Agenda Packet | Minutes | 38:56 (YT) |
| Wed, November 18, 2015 | Commission | Agenda Packet | Minutes | 1:35:41 (YT) |

Figure 1: Partial screen shot of "Past Meetings" table on Commission website

In November, the San Francisco Department of Technology (DT) migrated the Elections Commission's website from the Vision content management system (CMS) to Drupal. Drupal is an open source CMS licensed under the GNU General Public License. The migration affected all City departments, including the Department of Elections. The Commission was part of the second “wave” of departments and commissions to be migrated.

Since the migration changed parts of the website to a less convenient format (like it was prior to the summer of 2014), the Commission had to do work to ensure that past and future meetings again appear in the more convenient format.

5.3. Twitter

In September 2014, the Commission created a Twitter account with username [@SFElectionsComm](https://twitter.com/SFElectionsComm) (<https://twitter.com/SFElectionsComm>). The Twitter account is used only for posting administrative information and provides another convenient way for members of the

public to find out about things like upcoming meetings, when new documents are posted on the Commission website, when a new YouTube audio is posted, etc.

The Commission continued using the Twitter account for this purpose in 2015. As of December 31, 2015, the account had 59 total followers and a total of 114 tweets since the account was first created. For comparison, the Department's Twitter account @SFElections had approximately 750 followers at that time.

5.4. YouTube

The Commission created a YouTube account in September 2014 with its own YouTube channel. The Commission continued to post the audio for all Commission and BOPEC meetings to this channel throughout 2015.¹

As of December 31, 2015, the account had four “subscribers.” The account had audio for a total of 24 meetings, with 16 of those from 2015 (which is every Commission and BOPEC meeting in 2015). For meetings in 2015, the number of “views” ranged from 11 views for the December 2 BOPEC meeting to 124 views for the October 21 Commission meeting. The October 21 meeting is the meeting that had the five presenters on open source voting.

5.5. Commission Secretary

The Commission had been without a Commission Secretary for five months when 2015 began. The last day of the previous secretary, Ms. Debra Hayes, was on July 24, 2014. Ms. Hayes was the Commission's first choice after interviewing finalists in a special meeting on April 21, 2014.

At its August 2014 meeting, the Commission voted to authorize the President to contact the Commission's second and third choices from that previous April hiring process, and to offer the position if one of the two was interested.

In February 2015, after beginning the selection process for a new secretary, President Jerdonek learned that the previous two candidates had never been contacted. At its March meeting, the President sought guidance from the Commission, and the Commission reauthorized the President to contact the two runners-up as was previously voted. In March, President Jerdonek contacted the two individuals. The Commission's previous second choice was not interested, but the Commission's third choice, Ms. Nadya Hewitt, was.

Ms. Hewitt accepted the offer to be Commission Secretary in April. Her first day was April 21.

¹ The Commission's YouTube channel is <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCAXKDcd6YQ4FxHFUp8Hb5Jg>.

6. Open Source Voting and Next Voting System

San Francisco's next voting system and more generally open source voting were the biggest policy-related topics of the year.

6.1. Current Voting System

The Department's current voting system contract with Dominion Voting Systems is set to expire at the end of 2016. The contract was originally signed in 2007. It was a four-year contract with options to extend for two additional years. The 2016 expiration is the result of extending the original contract even further.

See Attachment 1 for a breakdown of the up-front and annual costs of acquiring and using the current system. The first four years had an up-front price of \$13.8 million. The cumulative price rises to \$19.7 million when including the years up to 2016.

Note that not all of the up-front cost was paid by San Francisco alone. Like all counties in California, San Francisco received federal funds through the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), as well as state funds from the Voting Modernization Bond Act of 2002. The latter was approved by California voters during the March 5, 2002 election as Proposition 41. It allocated \$200 million to upgrade voting systems and established a state Voting Modernization Board to carry out this task.

6.2. Open Source Voting Overview

In anticipation of issuing an RFP in early 2016, the Department of Elections issued a Request for Information (RFI) for a new voting system on August 6, 2015.² The RFI expressed a preference for an open source voting system. For example, the RFI stated on page 2—

The City formally supports the development and eventual implementation of open source voting systems; thus, any organization or firm that has developed or is developing a voting system based on open source code, or intends to do so, and is moving, or, is preparing to move, its open source system through the certification processes is encouraged to reply to this RFI.

An open source voting system is a voting system consisting of open source software running on commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) hardware, also known as “commodity” hardware.

Open source software is software whose source code is free for anyone to inspect, use, modify, and redistribute.³ The software is public and non-proprietary. More formally, open source software is software that has been released under a license approved by the nonprofit Open

2 The Department's Request for Information (RFI): <http://sfgov.org/elections/request-information-rfi-new-voting-system>

3 The Open Source Initiative's “open source definition”: <https://opensource.org/osd> .

Source Initiative (OSI). Such a license is known as an OSI-approved license.

The most common open source licenses are the Apache License 2.0, the BSD License 2.0, versions 2.0 and 3.0 of the GNU General Public License (GPL), and the MIT License. All of these are OSI-approved licenses. The GPL is a “copyleft” license, which means that if the software is changed and redistributed, then those changes must be also be made available under the same open source license. The other licenses are “permissive,” which means they are not copyleft.

The Linux and related Android operating systems and the Firefox browser are three well-known examples of open source software. The Chrome browser is also largely open source. Its sibling, the Chromium browser, is 100% open source. Open source software is widely used by technology companies large and small for commercial applications, but it is less common in government.

6.3. History of Open Source Voting in San Francisco

The idea to pursue an open source voting system in San Francisco goes back to around 2005 when activists first brought the idea to the attention of the Commission. Since then, the idea gradually gained more support in San Francisco. What follows is a brief summary of this history.

In May 2007, the Commission passed a resolution establishing a policy that the Department give priority to voting systems that “provide the maximum level of security and transparency possible consistent with the principles of public disclosure.” However, in December 2007, the City entered into contract for a new voting system that had no open source or even disclosed source components. This is partly because no such systems were certified, or even fully developed—as is still the case today.

In November 2008, the Board of Supervisors established a 7-member task force called the Voting Systems Task Force (VSTF). The task force was charged with making “recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about voting system standards, design and development, including models for development of a voting system including proprietary, disclosed and open source software and hardware.” Commissioner Donaldson, the newest member of the Elections Commission, in fact served as a member of the VSTF.

In June 2011, the VSTF completed its final report. It was 57 pages long. Its conclusions included a recommendation that San Francisco pursue an open source system. For example, the report said that “the Department of Elections should give strong preference to a voting system licensing structure that gives San Francisco all of the rights provided by a license approved by the Open Source Initiative (OSI),” and also that “San Francisco should be an active participant in the movement toward more open and transparent voting systems.”

In December 2014, the Board of Supervisors built on this report by unanimously passing a

resolution in support of creating an open source voting system (see Attachment 2). The resolution was authored by Supervisor Wiener and cosponsored by Supervisors Cohen, Kim, and Mar. The resolution committed San Francisco “to work with other jurisdictions and organizations to create new voting systems using open source software.” It also requested that the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) conduct a study of the feasibility of San Francisco developing an open source voting system.

At the Commission's June meeting, LAFCo's Executive Officer Jason Fried gave a presentation to the Commission with a question-and-answer session on a draft version of this report.

6.4. Request for Information (RFI)

It was in the above context that the Department issued its Request for Information (RFI) for a new voting system on August 6, as stated at the beginning of the previous section.

The RFI was notable for its level of transparency and visibility. The Department created a web page for the RFI (<http://sfgov.org/elections/request-information-rfi-new-voting-system>) and posted on this page all public correspondence, responses, and comments as they came in. A link to this page was posted prominently on the Department's home page and remained for months after the response period ended. This was helpful because open source was being discussed during this time, even though the RFI had concluded.

The RFI process let the Department (and the City as a whole) confirm whether any open source voting systems were available or under development.

Responses to the RFI were due on August 28. Thirteen organizations responded, and no open source systems were certified or otherwise available at that time. However, six respondents expressed an interest in or described working towards the development of an open source system. These were the California Association of Voting Officials (CAVO), Mr. Alan Dechert, Digital Foundry (joint with IDEO), Galois (which later created Free & Fair), Dr. Juan Gilbert of the University of Florida, and the Open Source Election Technology Foundation (OSET).

6.5. Commission Resolution

At its October meeting, the Commission held a hearing on open source voting systems and invited each of these six individuals or groups to give a 15-minute presentation. The purpose of the hearing was to hear directly from the open source RFI respondents and to learn more about what it would take for an open source system to be developed and certified. See Attachment 3 for the text of the invitation letter, which includes a number of questions that the presenters were asked to answer.

Five of the six invitees presented. These were Mr. Brent Turner, California Association of Voting Officials (CAVO); Mr. Alan Dechert; Dr. Joe Kiniry, Galois; Dr. Juan Gilbert, University of Florida; and Mr. Gregory Miller, Open Source Election Technology Foundation (OSET). The

meeting was the longest Commission meeting of the year and lasted approximately 3 hours and 45 minutes.

At the following meeting in November, the Commission unanimously passed a detailed resolution on open source voting (see Attachment 4). The resolution asked the San Francisco Mayor and Board of Supervisors to initiate and fund a project to develop and certify an open source voting system running on commercial off-the-shelf hardware for use in San Francisco. The resolution spelled out a number of key characteristics for the project, including the goal of being ready in time for the June 2020 election.

The resolution also established a new policy that the Department of Elections “support and work towards the adoption of a fully open voting system, including supporting the development, testing, and certification of such a system.”

The *San Francisco Examiner* featured the resolution as the main front-page story of its Thanksgiving edition. See Appendix C for a copy of that front page.

Following the Commission resolution, the Director decided to postpone issuing an RFP in early 2016 and instead to seek another extension of the current voting system contract. This decision was made to support the effort to pursue an open source voting system and to let the discussion and planning proceed with full focus.

California Secretary of State Alex Padilla is also aware of the activity around open source voting. At a Future of California Elections (<http://futureofcaelections.org>) forum in Sacramento on November 10, 2015, in response to a question from a member of the public, Secretary of State Padilla replied that he thought it was "quite possible" and "very likely" that an open source voting system would be certified by his office during his current term.⁴

7. Open Data

Open data was another topic of interest during 2015. At its May meeting, the Commission invited Joy Bonaguro, San Francisco's Chief Data Officer, to present to the Commission on open data.

Open data is a more flexible way of making information available to the public. Characteristics of open data are that it be digital, public, free, online, machine-readable, available in bulk, openly licensed, structured, documented, and up-to-date. Open data allows organizations and members of the public to process and analyze information in an automated fashion (e.g. using “apps” or other software).

An example of something that is not open data is a spreadsheet posted online as a PDF. A PDF is not open data because the information is not machine-readable and structured, even though it is

4 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GfzWt1TJ3qQ&t=35m00s>

digital and online. An open data alternative would be to provide the same information as a comma-separated value (CSV) text file, for example.

One example of the Department adopting open data is with the preliminary Statements of Vote. In elections prior to the November 2014 election, the Department posted preliminary precinct totals online only as PDF's (and that were hundreds of pages long). In the November 2014 election, the Department posted those totals also online as tab-separated value (TSV) text files. Such files can be opened using a conventional spreadsheet program like Excel, or processed easily using a scripting language like Python.

Ms. Bonaguro heads up a program in the Mayor's Office called DataSF (<https://datasf.org>) and the City's public open data portal, SF OpenData (<https://data.sfgov.org>). Her team assists City Departments in publishing more information as open data and also runs the City's Data Academy. The Academy offers classes for city employees on things like data management, data visualization, and information management.

The Department of Elections created a data inventory for DataSF, which enumerates and prioritizes the possible data sets that the Department can publish as open data in the future.

8. November 3, 2015 Municipal Election

The November 3, 2015 Municipal Election was a mayoral election with a number of other citywide offices on the ballot including City Attorney, District Attorney, Sheriff, and Treasurer. Thus, the election included ranked-choice voting (RCV) contests. The election also had one supervisor race (District 3) and several local measures.

The Department implemented a number of improvements during this election. These included—

- 1. Earlier election-night RCV tallies.** The Department resumed including round-by-round RCV tallies in the first set of preliminary reports on election night. Previously, the Department did this in 2012, but stopped doing so in 2013 and 2014. The Department had already been including RCV tallies in the final election night report throughout these years.
- 2. RCV tallies for all RCV contests.** The Department produced RCV tallies for all contests with at least two candidates listed, even if the winner could be determined by looking only at “raw” first choices (also known as “first choices as marked”). Previously, the Department did not run the RCV tally if a candidate had a majority of raw first choices. Raw first choice totals can differ from the first-round count of an RCV tally when ballots include skipped rankings.
- 3. Election certification: RCV tallies.** The Department included the round-by-round RCV reports with the certification letter sent to the Board of Supervisors after the election. Before this, the certification materials included only the raw first-choice totals.
- 4. Election certification: RCV tally summaries.** The Department included RCV tally

summaries within the body of the election certification letter. These summaries included the final round-by-round vote total for each candidate as opposed to only the first-round total. This provides a more informative summary.

5. **RCV tallying to two candidates.** The Department ran RCV tallies until just two candidates remained. This provides more information to the voters than stopping the tally at the earliest round in a which a majority is achieved.
6. **Cryptographic hashes.** The Department provided “SHA-512” hashes of each results file. This practice lets members of the public confirm that their file contents are correct after downloading.

9. Annual Evaluation of Director

In 2015, the Commission made a number of improvements to its annual process of evaluating the Director.

9.1. New Guidelines

At its February meeting, the Commission voted to adopt and post on its website a new process for evaluating the Director. This document is called, “Guidelines for Evaluation of Director of Elections” (see Attachment 5).

9.2. Biannual Reports

At its March meeting, the Commission voted to request biannual reports from the Department of Human Resources (DHR) regarding any complaints or grievances filed by Department of Elections employees.

At this meeting, the Commission learned from Deputy City Attorney White that DHR could provide the Commission with reports that would be compilations of summaries of DHR grievances and Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) complaints filed within the Department of Elections by Department employees.

The reports would provide to the maximum extent possible the non-confidential information regarding any complaints and grievances. Thus, the documents could be made public. However, if a report is presented in the context of a closed session for the purposes of evaluating the Director, then the report would be exclusive to that closed session.

9.3. Employee Interviews and Director Evaluation

At a special Commission meeting held during business hours on April 23, the Commission interviewed the following three Department employees in closed session: Deborah Brown, Manager of the Voter Services Division; Yelena Kravtsova, Manager of the Poll Worker unit of the Election Day Support Division; and Cuong Quach, Manager of the Ballot Distribution

Division.

The Commission completed its annual performance review of the Director using this new process after the Commission's June meeting.

10. Appendices

- A. Commission Bylaws relating to the Annual Report
- B. Commission Meeting Attendance
- C. San Francisco Examiner front page, Nov. 26, 2015

11. Attachments

- 1. Spreadsheet of Cumulative Cost of San Francisco's Current Voting System
- 2. Board of Supervisors Open Source Voting Systems Resolution
- 3. Invitation e-mail for hearing on open source voting systems
- 4. Elections Commission Open Source Voting Systems Resolution
- 5. Guidelines for Evaluation of Director of Elections

Appendix A

Commission Bylaws relating to the Annual Report

This appendix includes for convenience those sections of the Elections Commission Bylaws that mention the Commission Annual Report:

SAN FRANCISCO ELECTIONS COMMISSION BYLAWS

ARTICLE IV, COMMISSION'S POWERS AND DUTIES

M. The Commission shall prepare an annual report describing its activities and shall file such report with the Mayor and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors consistent with the Commission's duties under Section 4.103 of the San Francisco Charter and Sections 1.56 and 8.16 of the Administrative Code. This annual report shall cover the calendar year from January 1 through December 31.

ARTICLE V, OFFICERS

Section 2. The President

E. As soon as reasonably practicable following completion of each calendar year, the President who served at the conclusion of that calendar year shall present a draft annual report to the full Commission. An annual report shall be approved by the full Commission as soon as reasonably practicable following submission of the draft annual report.

ARTICLE XI, COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT

Section 1. Each year, the Commission President shall cause to be bound the "Commission Annual Report."

Section 2. The Commission Annual Report shall contain the President's report of the activities of the Commission during the previous year, as well as any other information the President deems significant and of likely assistance to subsequent Commissions.

Section 3. It is the intent to preserve and pass on to successive Commissions relevant information so as to make more effective subsequent Commission tenures by providing institutional memory to assist in resolution of recurring Commission problems.

The Commission Bylaws were last amended on June 19, 2013.

Appendix B

Commission Meeting Attendance

The table on the following page lists attendance for both Commission and BOPEC meetings.

Each column represents a seat on the Commission. A square shaded gray means the seat was vacant during that meeting. The column headers indicate the appointing authority for the seat.

The first of the following two tables shows what each abbreviated column header stands for. The second shows what the abbreviations in the cell contents mean. Parentheses around an abbreviation mean that the absence or lateness was excused.

| Abbr. | Appointing Authority |
|--------------|-----------------------------|
| BE | Board of Education |
| BS | Board of Supervisors |
| CA | City Attorney |
| DA | District Attorney |
| Ma | Mayor |
| PD | Public Defender |
| Tr | Treasurer |

Table 5: Key for column headers

| Abbr. | Attendance Status |
|--------------|--------------------------|
| A | Absent |
| L | Late |
| P | Present |
| V | Vacant |

Table 6: Key for cell contents

2015 Commission Attendance

| Date | Meeting Type | BE | BS | CA | DA | Ma | PD | Tr |
|--------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| January 7 | BOPEC (Canceled) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| January 21 | Commission | V | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| February 4 | BOPEC* | | P | | | | P | |
| February 18 | Commission | V | P | (A) | L | P | P | P |
| March 4 | BOPEC (Canceled) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| March 18 | Commission | P | P | V | P | P | P | L |
| April 1 | BOPEC (Canceled) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| April 15 | Commission | P | P | V | P | P | P | (L) |
| April 23 | Commission (Special) | (L) | P | V | (A) | P | P | P |
| May 6 | BOPEC (Canceled) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| May 20 | Commission | P | P | V | L | P | P | P |
| June 3 | BOPEC | (L) | P | | | | P | |
| June 17 | Commission | L | P | V | P | P | P | P |
| July 1 | BOPEC (Canceled) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| July 15 | Commission (Canceled) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| August 5 | BOPEC | P | P | | | | P | |
| August 19 | Commission | P | P | V | P | P | P | P |
| September 2 | BOPEC (Canceled) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| September 16 | Commission | P | P | V | (A) | (A) | P | P |
| October 7 | BOPEC (Canceled) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| October 21 | Commission | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| November 4 | BOPEC (Canceled) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| November 18 | Commission | P | P | P | P | P | P | A |
| December 2 | BOPEC | L | P | | | | P | |
| December 16 | Commission | P | P | L | A | P | P | P |

Appendix C

This is a copy of the front page of the San Francisco Examiner on November 26, 2015.

The article on page 4 was about the open source voting systems resolution that the Commission passed on November 18. The article was written by Joshua Sabatini and was called, "San Francisco sets sights on open source voting by November 2019."⁵

Mancini's SLEEPWORLD
Simply the Best Place to Buy a Mattress
BIGGEST SALE EVER
SEE PAGE 18 & 19

HERA housing and economic rights advocates
The Legal Answers You are looking for!
SEE PAGE 9

Examiner SAN FRANCISCO SINCE 1865
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 2015 | SERVING SAN FRANCISCO, SAN MATEO AND SANTA CLARA COUNTIES | SFEXAMINER.COM
56° 42° Clear

HAPPY THANKSGIVING

THE CITY
Safety measure
Stop signs installed where kids were hit
PAGE 8

CRIME INK
Bad company
Shrimp Boy trial has notorious cast
PAGE 10

JAY MARIOTTI
Heisman hype
Sleepy East Coasters missing McCaffrey
PAGE 16

AGE
Holiday events
Plenty of things to do in S.F. and beyond
PAGES 22-25

Updating voting
San Francisco sets sights on open-source elections by November 2019 PAGE 4

Join our Premier Club and earn .80% APY* on your Money Market Account. Call or visit to start earning more now.

Sterling bank & trust PREMIER CLUB
1(800) 944-BANK sterlingbank.com

*Annual Percentage Yield (APY) is effective as of 11/16/2015 and is subject to change without notice. \$500 minimum opening deposit required in money market account. Rates are compounded monthly and paid on the entire balance in the account. Fees may reduce earnings if the average minimum monthly balance of \$500 is not maintained. Membership in the Sterling Premier Club is required. Contact us for Club member requirements.

MEMBER FDIC

⁵ <http://www.sfexaminer.com/san-francisco-sets-sights-on-open-source-voting-by-november-2019>

Current Voting System Costs

| Year | Hardware* | Software** | Other | Election Services | Yearly Total | Total (cumulative) | Years | Yearly Total (cumulative) | Notes | | | |
|----------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Initial | \$6,528,933.25 | \$1,400,000.00 | \$1,708,000.00 | | \$9,636,933.25 | | | | | | | |
| 2008*** | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | | \$994,800.00 | \$994,800.00 | \$10,631,733.25 | 1 | \$10,631,733.25 | | | | |
| 2009 | \$203,800.00 | \$182,500.00 | | \$497,400.00 | \$883,700.00 | \$11,515,433.25 | 2 | \$5,757,716.63 | | | | |
| 2010 | \$203,800.00 | \$182,500.00 | | \$994,800.00 | \$1,381,100.00 | \$12,896,533.25 | 3 | \$4,298,844.42 | | | | |
| 2011 | \$203,800.00 | \$182,500.00 | | \$497,400.00 | \$883,700.00 | \$13,780,233.25 | 4 | \$3,445,058.31 | End of initial four-year contract. | | | |
| 2012 | \$203,800.00 | \$182,500.00 | | \$994,800.00 | \$1,381,100.00 | \$15,161,333.25 | 5 | \$3,032,266.65 | | | | |
| 2013 | \$203,800.00 | \$182,500.00 | | \$497,400.00 | \$883,700.00 | \$16,045,033.25 | 6 | \$2,674,172.21 | End of initial contract after exercising two-year extension. | | | |
| 2014 | \$203,800.00 | \$182,500.00 | | \$994,800.00 | \$1,381,100.00 | \$17,426,133.25 | 7 | \$2,489,447.61 | | | | |
| 2015 | \$203,800.00 | \$182,500.00 | | \$497,400.00 | \$883,700.00 | \$18,309,833.25 | 8 | \$2,288,729.16 | | | | |
| 2016 | \$203,800.00 | \$182,500.00 | | \$994,800.00 | \$1,381,100.00 | \$19,690,933.25 | 9 | \$2,187,881.47 | | | | |
| Total | \$8,159,333.25 | \$2,860,000.00 | \$1,708,000.00 | \$6,963,600.00 | \$19,690,933.25 | | | | | | | |
| Notes: | <p>The initial contract was four years with options to renew two additional years. *The per-year hardware costs (i.e. after the "initial") are for hardware maintenance (i.e. parts and repairs). **The per-year software costs (i.e. after the "initial") are the software license fees. ***The hardware maintenance and software license fees for 2008 were included in the initial cost. The numbers above are not adjusted for inflation to be in "today's dollars."</p> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Source: | <p>The numbers in this spreadsheet for 2008 to 2011 come from the following document provided to me by Director Arntz: City and County of San Francisco, Office of Contract Administration, Purchasing Division, First Amendment ("San Francisco Purchase Agreement First Amendment 01/18/08"). The numbers for 2012 to 2016 come from SF LAFCo's draft "Study on Open Source Voting Systems," dated May 13, 2015.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | |

1 [Supporting the Creation of Open Source Voting Systems - Studying New Models of Voting
2 System Development]

3 **Resolution committing the City and County of San Francisco to work with other**
4 **jurisdictions and organizations to create new voting systems using open source**
5 **software; and to study the feasibility of the City and County of San Francisco**
6 **developing and using a new voting system, either whole or in part, through a**
7 **collaborative model like the Los Angeles County Voting Systems Assessment Project.**

8
9 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco holds it in the interest of its citizens
10 to conduct efficient and accurate elections in a manner which promotes public trust in the
11 integrity of every aspect of the elections process; and

12 WHEREAS, Transparency in the recording, collection, transmission, aggregation and
13 tally of votes promotes public confidence in the integrity of elections; and

14 WHEREAS, A growing number of government leaders, good government groups,
15 citizens, and media reports have questioned the value and integrity of the existing, limited
16 choices of voting systems certified for use in conducting elections; and

17 WHEREAS, A limited number of vendors dominate the voting systems marketplace,
18 reducing incentives to innovate, and their refusal to make public their voting system software
19 and hardware designs conflicts with the goal of election transparency; and

20 WHEREAS, In order to address these issues, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
21 on November 18, 2008, adopted Ordinance No. 268-08, File No. 081227, amending the
22 Administrative Code by adding Sections 5.400-410 to establish a Voting Systems Task Force
23 comprised of individuals with backgrounds in good government, computer science or the
24 computer industry, election administration, and accommodations of persons with disabilities,
25 to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about voting system standards, design

1 and development; and

2 WHEREAS, Pursuant to Ordinance No. 268-08, the San Francisco Voting Systems
3 Task Force was created to provide the City with recommendations on: standards and
4 guidelines for development and acquisition of voting systems; methods for acquiring voting
5 systems in conformity with federal, state and municipal laws; models for the development of a
6 voting system; business models, including the City and County of San Francisco acting as its
7 own vendor, which promote transparency; and any other issues related to voting systems
8 which will engender public trust in the elections processes of the City and County of San
9 Francisco; and

10 WHEREAS, In June 2011, "Recommendations on Voting Systems for the City and
11 County of San Francisco – A Report by the San Francisco Voting Systems Task Force
12 (VSTF)" was completed, in which the VSTF recommended that San Francisco advocate with
13 the California Secretary of State and the State legislature for a new, comprehensive state
14 certification process to replace the existing requirement for federal certification; and

15 WHEREAS, California Governor Jerry Brown on October 5, 2013, approved California
16 Senate Bill No. 360 amending the California Elections Code to create a comprehensive state
17 certification process and adding a new Section 19006 to the Elections Code stating the intent
18 of the Legislature that:

19 (a) All voting systems be certified or conditionally approved by the Secretary of State,
20 independent of voluntary federal qualification or certification, before they are used in
21 future elections to ensure that the voting systems have the ability to meet accuracy,
22 accessibility, and security standards.

23 (b) The Secretary of State adopt and publish testing standards that meet or exceed
24 federal voluntary standards set by the United States Election Assistance Commission
25 or its successor agency.

1 (c) The Secretary of State study and encourage the development of voting systems
2 that use nonproprietary source code and that are easy to audit.

3 (d) A local jurisdiction may use available public funds to purchase and maintain any
4 certified or conditionally approved voting system or part of a voting system.

5 (e) California receives the benefits of the publicly funded development of a
6 nonproprietary voting system in the state.

7 (f) A local jurisdiction may use available public funds to research and develop a
8 nonproprietary voting system that uses disclosed source codes, including the
9 manufacture of a limited number of voting system units, for use in a pilot program or for
10 submission to the Secretary of State for certification; and

11 WHEREAS, The VSTF in its June 2011 report also recommended that:

12 (a) the San Francisco Department of Elections give strong preference to a voting
13 system licensing structure that gives San Francisco all of the rights provided by a
14 license approved by the Open Source Initiative, a global non-profit that supports and
15 promotes the open source movement (“OSI-approved license”), even if the system is
16 maintained by an external party.

17 (b) San Francisco work with other jurisdictions and organizations, if an open source
18 model is used, to develop and manage the code-base in order to leverage additional
19 resources and expertise, and participate during the requirements gathering stage of
20 development so that its unique requirements can be incorporated into the system
21 design and implementation.

22 (c) San Francisco be an active participant in the movement toward more open and
23 transparent voting systems, acknowledging the complexity of moving from the existing
24 marketplace toward more innovative voting systems; urging San Francisco to move
25 steadily toward the goal of transparency—even if it must do so in incremental steps;

1 encouraging the City to be a strong advocate in the private sector marketplace for more
2 transparent systems and to be open as well to new collaborative development models;
3 and

4 WHEREAS, The Los Angeles County Voting Systems Assessment Project (VSAP) is a
5 collaborative project to design and implement a new voting system that was launched by the
6 Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk and is a project that San Francisco
7 officials can learn from; and

8 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco recognizes that development and
9 certification of these systems will entail substantial investment, but by pooling resources from
10 other jurisdictions and organizations, the cost to each participant can be reduced; now,
11 therefore be it

12 RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco supports the movement
13 toward more open and transparent voting systems and the creation of new voting systems
14 using open source software and inexpensive commodity components; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors requests that the Local Agency
16 Formation Commission conduct a study of the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the City
17 and County of San Francisco leading an effort to develop and use a new voting system, either
18 whole or in part, through a collaborative model, and which includes researching and
19 presenting options for structuring such a development project, as well as reviewing the work
20 of the Los Angeles Voting Systems Assessment Project (VSAP) and its process of voting
21 system design and acting as its own vendor, as a model for San Francisco in its pursuit of
22 transparent, secure and fair elections.



City and County of San Francisco

Tails

Resolution

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

File Number: 141105

Date Passed: December 09, 2014

Resolution committing the City and County of San Francisco to work with other jurisdictions and organizations to create new voting systems using open source software; and to study the feasibility of the City and County of San Francisco developing and using a new voting system, either whole or in part, through a collaborative model like the Los Angeles County Voting Systems Assessment Project.

December 03, 2014 Rules Committee - RECOMMENDED

December 09, 2014 Board of Supervisors - AMENDED

Ayes: 10 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener and Yee

December 09, 2014 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED AS AMENDED

Ayes: 10 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener and Yee

File No. 141105

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED AS AMENDED on 12/9/2014 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Handwritten signature of Angela Calvillo

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

Unsigned

12/19/14

Mayor

Date Approved

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, or time waived pursuant to Board Rule 2.14.2, became effective without his approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter or Board Rule 2.14.2.

Handwritten signature of Angela Calvillo

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

OPEN SOURCE VOTING SYSTEMS HEARING: INVITATION E-MAIL

To provide context, below are the contents of the e-mail invitation that was sent on October 7, 2015 to each of the invited presenters.

Dear _____:

I would like to invite one or more representatives of your organization, _____, to speak before the San Francisco Elections Commission at its next regularly scheduled meeting. The meeting will be held at 6PM on Wednesday, October 21, 2015 in Room 408 of San Francisco City Hall.

As President of the San Francisco Elections Commission, I will be scheduling a hearing on the topic of open source voting systems at this meeting. I'm planning to let each invited organization present for about 15 minutes and then follow this with time for questions from the Commissioners. The format and amount of time may change between now and the meeting.

Here are some questions that I personally would like to see answered during the hearing:

How long do you think it will be before an open source voting system is certified for use in California and available for use by a jurisdiction like San Francisco? What steps do you think need to take place for that to happen? What are some possible ways forward? Why hasn't a system like this been developed and certified yet by your organization or anyone else? What open source license or type of open source license do you think should be used and why (e.g. OSI-approved or non-OSI-approved, permissive or copyleft, etc)? If San Francisco were to adopt an open source system, how could San Francisco be assured that the system would continue to be developed and maintained over time?

If your organization would like to speak during this hearing, please reply to this e-mail. More information about the Commission can be found on our website below. You are also welcome to contact me with questions. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Chris Jerdonek, President
San Francisco Elections Commission

Website: <http://sfgov.org/electionscommission>

Twitter: @SFElectionsComm

1 **Open Source Voting Systems Resolution**

2 Adopted by the San Francisco Elections Commission (6-0) on November 18, 2015.

3
4 [Supporting Open Source Voting Systems — Encouraging the Mayor and Board
5 of Supervisors to Initiate a Project to Develop and Certify an Open Source Voting System]

6 **Resolution to support the development and certification of an open source voting**
7 **system running on commercial off-the-shelf hardware; and to request that the Mayor**
8 **and Board of Supervisors initiate and fund a project to develop and certify such a**
9 **system for use in San Francisco.**

10 WHEREAS, Free and fair elections, as a cornerstone of the democratic process,
11 demand the highest levels of public openness, accessibility, accuracy, security, and
12 trustworthiness;

13 WHEREAS, The public benefits from elections that, in their conduct and operation, also
14 have increased efficiency, innovation, and affordability;

15 WHEREAS, The San Francisco Elections Commission (“Elections Commission”) on
16 May 16, 2007 adopted a resolution that—

17 (a) Cited concerns raised by members of the Board of Supervisors about ratifying a
18 contract for voting machines which did not allow for open source software; and that

19 (b) Established a policy that the San Francisco Department of Elections (“Department
20 of Elections”) shall endeavor in contracting to prioritize and select if possible, voting
21 systems and vendors which provide the maximum level of security and transparency
22 possible consistent with the principles of public disclosure;

23 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco (“San Francisco”) on December 11,
24 2007, and as amended on January 18, 2008, entered into a four-year voting system

1 agreement with Sequoia Voting Systems, Inc. at a cost of \$13.78 million — an agreement that
2 the Board of Supervisors extended and that will expire on January 1, 2017;

3 WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors on November 18, 2008 created a Voting
4 Systems Task Force to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about voting
5 system standards, design and development, including models for development of a voting
6 system including proprietary, disclosed and open source software and hardware approaches
7 and which address aforementioned voting systems requirements and assure a cost effective,
8 highly reliable, maintainable system;

9 WHEREAS, The Voting Systems Task Force in June 2011 completed its report, which
10 recommended in part that—

11 (a) The Department of Elections should give strong preference to a voting system
12 licensing structure that gives San Francisco all of the rights provided by a license
13 approved by the Open Source Initiative (OSI), even if the system is maintained by an
14 external party; and that

15 (b) If an open source model is used, that San Francisco work with other jurisdictions
16 and organizations to develop and manage the code-base in order to leverage
17 additional resources and expertise; and

18 (c) San Francisco should be an active participant in the movement toward more open
19 and transparent voting systems;

20 WHEREAS, After the November 2016 election, San Francisco will have spent \$19.69
21 million over nine years on its current voting system agreement, including \$2.86 million on
22 software licensing fees, \$6.53 million on hardware, and \$1.63 million on hardware
23 maintenance;

24 WHEREAS, The California legislature, in enacting SB 360 in 2013, expressed its

1 intention that—

2 (a) The Secretary of State study and encourage the development of voting systems
3 that use nonproprietary source code and that are easy to audit;

4 (b) California receive the benefits of the publicly funded development of a
5 nonproprietary voting system in the state; and

6 (c) Provides for the experimental use of a voting system in a pilot program if the voting
7 system uses only software and firmware with disclosed source code, except for
8 unmodified commercial off-the-shelf software and firmware;

9 WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors on December 9, 2014 unanimously passed
10 Resolution No. 460-14, which committed San Francisco to work with other jurisdictions and
11 organizations to create new voting systems using open source software, and which stated
12 further that—

13 (a) San Francisco supports the movement toward more open and transparent voting
14 systems and the creation of new voting systems using open source software and
15 inexpensive commodity components; and

16 (b) The Board of Supervisors requests that the Local Agency Formation Commission
17 conduct a study of the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of San Francisco leading an
18 effort to develop and use a new voting system, either whole or in part, through a
19 collaborative model;

20 WHEREAS, The Department of Elections on August 6, 2015 issued a Request for
21 Information (RFI) for a new voting system, expressing a preference for voting systems
22 designed using open source software;

23 WHEREAS, The Department received thirteen responses to the RFI by the August 28,
24 2015 deadline, all of which left significant gaps in meeting the RFI requirements with existing

1 voting systems; and

2 WHEREAS, Six RFI respondents proposed predominantly open source systems,
3 though in the absence of funding, none have yet been fully developed or certified; and

4 WHEREAS, The Local Agency Formation Commission on October 23, 2015 issued its
5 final report, “Study on Open Source Voting Systems,” which analyzed the possibility of San
6 Francisco leading an effort to develop and use an open source voting system, and concluded
7 in part that several ongoing voting system projects can be adopted and provide an opportunity
8 for San Francisco to expedite the development of an open source voting system, if San
9 Francisco chooses to develop its own voting system;

10 WHEREAS, The Elections Commission on October 21, 2015 held a public hearing on
11 open source voting systems during which five of the six open source RFI respondents gave
12 presentations on the benefits of open source voting systems and on possible ways forward for
13 San Francisco to develop and adopt a certified open source voting system;

14 WHEREAS, Any open source software license approved by the Open Source Initiative
15 (OSI) ensures that the software can be freely viewed, used, changed, and redistributed — in
16 modified or unmodified form — by anyone, including people, organizations, and governmental
17 entities;

18 WHEREAS, The transparency of open source software promotes greater trust and
19 public confidence in its use, and in particular permits greater security and correctness through
20 increased public scrutiny and feedback from experts;

21 WHEREAS, For the purposes of this resolution, “open voting system” means a voting
22 system whose software is open source under OSI-approved software licenses; whose
23 electronic hardware is commercial off-the-shelf (COTS); and whose auxiliary development
24 products, materials, and documents related to areas such as requirements, design, build,

1 installation, testing, and user documentation, and any additional materials submitted to gain
2 regulatory approval, are freely and openly licensed;

3 WHEREAS, The current voting system marketplace provides little or no incentive for
4 established vendors to offer an open voting system, and the initial development and
5 certification costs make it prohibitive for new industry entrants to do so;

6 WHEREAS, Since elections are a public process undergirding democracy across the
7 United States, access to improved voting systems should not be limited only to those
8 jurisdictions with greater financial means, and all jurisdictions should be free to make
9 improvements to those systems on their own as needed;

10 WHEREAS, The development and certification of an open voting system could not only
11 provide San Francisco with an affordable, accurate, flexible, and secure voting system, but
12 could benefit all election jurisdictions across the country by providing them such an option;

13 WHEREAS, Additionally, copyleft provisions in open source software licenses would
14 help ensure that everyone, including San Francisco, has free access to future changes and
15 improvements to that software, providing a way for San Francisco to derive additional benefit
16 from the creation of an open voting system; and

17 WHEREAS, As a leader in innovative public policy initiatives and as a hub for
18 innovation in software and open source — with the San Francisco Bay Area home to many
19 well-known organizations like Apple, Facebook, GitHub, Google, the Mozilla Foundation,
20 Twitter, Yahoo, and countless others contributing significantly to open source software — San
21 Francisco is a natural jurisdiction to take the lead in developing and certifying an open voting
22 system; now, therefore be it

23 RESOLVED, That it be the position of the Elections Commission that open voting
24 systems using paper ballots have the potential to provide the greatest degree of accessibility,

1 accuracy, transparency, security, auditability, affordability, and flexibility in elections, and so
2 would best serve the voters of San Francisco; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Elections Commission expresses its appreciation to
4 the Board of Supervisors for its past resolution in support of open source voting systems
5 running on inexpensive commodity components, and encourages the Mayor and Board of
6 Supervisors to initiate and fund a project, starting in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016,
7 with the goal of ensuring that an open voting system be available for use by the Department
8 of Elections for the June 2020 Presidential Primary Election, and for partial or pilot use by the
9 November 2019 Municipal Election or earlier; and, be it

10 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Elections Commission encourages the Mayor and
11 Board of Supervisors to consider incorporating the following characteristics into such a
12 project:

13 (a) First, hire a project director with technical expertise to be responsible for planning
14 and leading the project, including working with stakeholders, collaborators, and
15 regulators; drafting system requirements; and selecting and managing technical
16 contractors, as necessary;

17 (b) Incorporate openness and transparency into the project, for example by forming a
18 public committee of experts and citizens to advise the project director, and by releasing
19 all development products, including software source code and documentation, as they
20 are developed;

21 (c) Design and implement the voting system in a modular fashion, by developing
22 components like the ballot layout software, scanner device drivers, a central scanner, a
23 precinct scanner, an accessible voting device, tabulation software, and the election
24 results reporter independently and in parallel, using open data formats to communicate

- 1 with one another;
- 2 (d) Express a preference for open source licenses with copyleft characteristics so that
3 San Francisco and other jurisdictions can benefit from future improvements that others
4 make to the voting system components;
- 5 (e) Build on prior open source work where possible to reduce project time and costs;
- 6 (f) Permit the selection of different organizations to develop different components of the
7 voting system to reduce project risk, for example by issuing separate, smaller
8 Requests for Proposal (RFPs) for each voting system component;
- 9 (g) Spread project costs over multiple years to reduce risk, spending funds in
10 subsequent years only after the results of prior expenditures are known;
- 11 (h) Produce production-ready deliverables early on and incrementally as in an agile
12 approach to further reduce risks and costs, rather than waiting until the conclusion of
13 the project to deliver finished versions of all components;
- 14 (i) Certify and use components of the voting system in real elections prior to the
15 completion of the full system, for example by facilitating pilot projects of the form
16 permitted by SB 360 and/or the use of a blended system during a transition period that
17 incorporates components from both a proprietary system and the open system being
18 developed;
- 19 (j) Work with the California Secretary of State's Office before the completion of each
20 component to maximize the likelihood of state certification;
- 21 (k) Recruit other organizations, including other jurisdictions, universities, open source
22 software organizations, and commercial entities with an interest in open source, to
23 cosponsor, fund, and help manage the development, certification, and maintenance of
24 the voting system;

1 (l) Explore the possibility of innovative partnerships with public and private entities that
2 could let San Francisco further reduce, and even recover, project costs;

3 (m) Seek grants from foundations, other government agencies, and nonprofit
4 organizations with a similar interest in election openness to help fund and support the
5 project; and, be it

6 FINALLY RESOLVED, That it be the policy of the Department of Elections to support
7 and work towards the adoption of a fully open voting system, including supporting the
8 development, testing, and certification of such a system.

Guidelines for Evaluation of Director of Elections

(Adopted by the Elections Commission at its Feb. 18, 2015 meeting.)

This document sets forth some guidelines for the Commission's evaluation of the Director of Elections ("Director"). This procedure may vary from year to year, and for each evaluation, the Commission will vote on the specific procedures to be followed. The evaluation will consist of the following components – interviews of Elections Department employees, Commissioner written evaluations, Director of Elections self-evaluation, and Commission discussion. Each of these components are discussed below.

1. Interviews of Department of Elections Employees

The Commission will interview Department of Elections employees using the following process:

a. The President of the Commission will select approximately two Department employees to be invited to a Commission meeting to discuss the performance of the Director. The President may seek the input of all Commission members as to the number and identity of the persons to be invited. However, the decision with respect to the number and identity will rest in the sole discretion of the President.

b. The Commission will invite the employees identified by the President to appear at a Commission meeting to discuss the Director's performance. The meeting will be scheduled as a special meeting to occur during the Department's normal working hours. The invited employees will be advised that their participation is voluntary, and that the Commission anticipates their statements will occur in closed session and remain confidential to the maximum extent permitted under the open meeting and other applicable laws. The Director will not be present for these employee interviews.

c. The Commission will advise the Director that the Commission expects him or her not to question employees regarding the employee interviews.

2. Director Self-Evaluation

The Director of Elections will be asked to provide a written self-evaluation to each of the Commissioners. The self-evaluation will be on the form attached as Exhibit A.

3. Commissioners' Individual Written Evaluations

Following the employee interviews and receipt of the Director's self-evaluation, the Commissioners will each submit a written evaluation of the Director. The written evaluations will be on the form attached as Exhibit A. Each Commissioner's written evaluation will be provided to the President or the President's designee. Following the completion of the evaluation process, the President or the President's designee will provide the Commissioner evaluations and the Director's self-evaluation to the Deputy City Attorney office for retention so long as such retention is required by law.

4. Commission's Collective Written Evaluation

Following the employee interviews, the Director's self-evaluation, and the Commissioners' individual written evaluations, the Commission will discuss the Director's performance during a Commission meeting. Following this discussion, the President or the President's designee will reduce the Commission's collective evaluation to writing, which will be provided confidentially to the Director, each Commissioner, and the Deputy City Attorney.

Exhibit A

CONFIDENTIAL

Submitted by: _____

Date: _____

**San Francisco Elections Commission
Director of the Department of Elections
Performance Evaluation**

The following is the calendar year _____ performance evaluation of _____, Director of the San Francisco Department of Elections.

Rating Scale:

- 1 = Unsatisfactory
- 2 = Needs Improvement
- 3 = Average
- 4 = Above Average
- 5 = Superior

I. ELECTIONS

- 1. Ensures free, fair and functional elections with no or only non-material errors, and deals effectively with anomalies.**

Rating (1-5):

Comments:

- 2. Demonstrates an understanding of and effectively implements election laws, codes and deadlines.**

Rating (1-5):

Comments:

3. Shows innovation and effectiveness in the elections process.

Rating: (1-5)

Comments:

4. Implements programs to effectively communicate with voters and educate them on election requirements, deadlines and procedures.

Rating (1-5):

Comments:

II. COMMUNICATION

1. Effectively communicates the Department of Elections' mission, strategy, goals and other essential information to the Commission including, but not limited to duties specified in City Charter Section 13.105;

Rating (1-5):

Comments:

2. Effectively interacts with the Commission through timely and thorough providing of information;

Rating (1-5)

Comments:

3. Implements the Commission's policies

Rating (1-5)

Comments:

III. ADMINISTRATION

1. Builds and maintains an environment that fosters and contributes to the effective operation of the DOE including teamwork among DOE staff;

Rating (1-5):

Comments:

2. Effectively uses and manages DOE personnel;

Rating (1-5):

Comments:

3. Demonstrates the ability to manage changing work conditions and problem situations quickly and effectively.

Rating (1-5):

Comments:

IV. RESOURCES

- 1. Effectively uses and manages DOE budget and resources.**

Rating (1-5):

Comments:

V. OVERALL

- 1. Overall Evaluation (based on the above factors)**

Rating (1-5):

Comments: