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1. **Project Description -** This information will be used for listings and report to the Governor and  
    General Assembly on capital funded projects.

The project will alleviate the burden on towns randomly selected to perform post election audits.

1. **Summary.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary - Describe the high level summary of this project in plain English without technical jargon** |
| Connecticut law requires that 10% of the polling places used in an election be randomly selected to perform post election audits. There are roughly 750 polling places in the state and so 75 are randomly selected by a public drawing. The purpose of these audits is to check the performance of the technology and so the law does not allow for the ballots to simply be re-inserted into the tabulators. Instead, the towns are required to perform the audit manually. To do that, local election officials hire people to peform the audit. Because the selection of who will be audited is random, it is not an activity that towns will budget for in advance.  Using federal funding, the Secretary of the State, in conjunction with UCONN Center for Voting Technology Research, has developed new software which will assist towns by automating the post election audit process. Funding will support the acquisition of scanners so that we have the capacity to serve up to 75 towns within the 10 days required by law. |
| **Purpose – Describe the purpose of the project** |
| Instead of a manual post election audit process, the new software uses high speed scanners to review the ballots and in doing so it isolates only those ballots with unclear or extraneous marking to be reviewed manually. This allows us to perform an audit of the election technology, but still gain efficiencies by using new independent technologies.  The technology has been piloted in several communities over the last 18 months, and local officials welcome the change. Right now the agency only has 2 scanners which were used during these pilots. To be able to serve up to 75 towns the agency will require at least 10 additional scanners. The equipment will then be deployed regionally so that towns may travel nearby to use the scanners under the supervision the Secretary of the State, and/or IT consultants. |
| **Importance – Describe why this project is important** |
| The purpose of the post election audit is to ensure the integrity of our elections technology. But because the selection is random towns cannot budget for the expense and so some resisitence to the audit process has developed over the years. This has led to repeated efforts to erode the current standards of the audit through proposed legislation.  This technology addresses the need among towns to alleviate cost while still protecting the integrity of our elections. |
| **Outcomes – What are the expected outcomes of this project** |
| Towns will be relieved by providing a technological solution to replace a manual process that their budget does not anticipate. In fact, the random drawing often chooses multiple voting locations from a single town. |
| **Approach and Success Evaluation – Provide details of how the success of the project will be evaluated** |
| The project has been piloted in several communities already, demonstrating the accuracy of the system and local interest in the technology. |

1. **Business Goals**. List up to 10 key business goals you have for this project, when (FY) the goal  
   is expected to be achieved, and how you will measure achievement, Must have at least one.  
   Please use action phrases beginning with a verb to state each goal. Example: "Reduce the  
   Permitting process by 50%". In the Expected Result column, please explain what data you will use to  
   demonstrate the goal is being achieved and any current metrics.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Business Goal (Action Phase)** | **Target FY for Goal** | **Current Condition** | **Expected Result** |
| Improve accuracy of audits | FY 16 | Human hand counts subject to error. | Improved accuracy. |
| Save municipal funds. | FY 16 | Audits require per diem workers. Expense cannot be planned for. | Savings for towns due to reduced labor costs. Estimated savings to Connecticut towns will be more than $250,000 per statewide occurance. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1. **Technology Goals**. From a technical perspective, following the above example, list up to 10 key technology goals you have for this project and in which Fiscal Year (FY) the goal is expected to be achieved. Please use action phrases beginning with a verb to state each goal. Example: “Improve transaction response time by 10%".

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Technology Goal** | **Target FY for Goal** | **Current Condition** | **Expected Result** |
| Using technology to streamline administrative requirements | FY16 | Accuracy of handcounts is subject to human error | Up to 75 towns will be able to use new technology to perform post-election audits |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1. **Priority Alignment.** The criteria in this table, in concert with other factors, will be used to determine project  
    priorities in the capital funding approval process. Briefly describe how the proposed projects will align with each criterion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority Criterion** | **Y/N** | **Explanation** |
| Is this project aligned with the Governor’s Key Priorities? | Yes | Supports the integrity of elections; increased efficiency through technology and regional approaches |
| Is this project aligned with business and IT goals of your agency? | Yes | Streamlining of administrative requirements and above goals |
| Does this project reduce or prevent future increases to the agency’s operating budget? | No | Alleviates costs to towns required under state election laws. |
| Will this project result in shared capabilities? | No | Permanency of technology is not anticipated or required because post election audits are selected randomly |
| Is this project being Co-developed through participation of multiple agencies? | Yes | The project was developed by SOTS and UConn Center for Voting Technology with funding from the federal Election Assistance Commission |
| Has the agency demonstrated readiness to manage project of this size and scope? | Yes | Secretary of the State is the chief elections officialand UCONN Center for Voting Technology is the authority on Connecticut election technology |
| Is the agency ready to deliver the business value proposed? | Yes | The program has been completed and pilot tested. |

1. **Organizational Preparedness**. Is your agency prepared to undertake this project? Is senior management committed, willing to participate, and willing to allocate the necessary time, energy and staffing resources? How will the project be managed and/or governed and who will make the key project decisions?

Using technology to enhance the election process is a major priority of the Secretary of the State. The oversight of the project will fall with the the Director of the Elections Division, Peggy Reeves.

1. **Project Ramp Up**. If capital funds are awarded for this project, how long will it take to ramp up? What are the key ramp-up requirements and have any off these already been started? For example, has a project manager been identified? Has an RFI been issued? Is a major procurement required such as an RFP?

The project requires minimal ramp up efforts because the technology has already been through field testing . The performance specifications have been determined. To ensure the scanners meet the necessary specifications , UCONN Center for Voting Technology Research will assist in selection and procurement.

1. **Organizational Skills**. Do you have the experienced staff with the proper training to sustain this initiative once it’s a production system? Do you anticipate having to hire additional staff to sustain this? What training efforts are expected to be needed to maintain this system?

The staff of the Secretary of the State and UConn Center for Voting Technology were the developers of the system and so there is no question that they have the experience necessary to sustain the technology. No additional staff will be required, although some IT consultants will need to be onsite to assist if necessary. The scanners will be deployed regionally throughout the state so that towns can travel nearby to use the technology.

1. **Financial Estimates.** From IT Capital Investment Fund Financial Spreadsheet

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Estimated Total Development Cost** | **Estimated total Capital Funding Request** | **Estimated Annual Operating Cost** | **One Time Financial Benefit** | **Recurring Annual Financial Benefit** |
| $424,000 | $100,000 | $28,000 | $0 to state | None to state  Up to $300,000/annually to towns |
| **Explanation of Estimates** | | | | |
| 10% of polls will be selected for post election audits, which must be completed in 10 days. We estimate that the new automated system will take 350 hours of work to complete all 75 audits. The ten scanners will be prepared by UCONN voting tech center and each audit location will be staffed with an IT person from UCONN and a elections staff person from the Secretary of the State.  The technology has been developed and paid for by federal grant money. The product has been field tested in recent years. Bonding money will bring the product to scale to be able to serve Connecticut towns. | | | | |
| **Assumptions: Please list key assumptions you are using to estimate project development and implementation costs** | | | | |
| The individual scanners will cost $10,000 and will be owned and maintained by the state. The project will require onsite IT assistance and the agency expects to use UCONN for this purpose, as well as the required preparation of the scanners. The audits will be performed regionally and we expect that we will use 5 locations with 2 scanners in each of them. | | | | |

III. **Expanded Business Case**

1. **Project Impact.** Beyond the top business goals identified in Section II, 1) What impacts will this project  
    have, if any, in the targeted areas below, 2) What would be the impact of not doing this project, 3) How will the project demonstrate benefits are achieved.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **(1) Impact Area (Vision)** | **Y/N** | **Description of Project Impact** |
| Will this project provide efficient and easily accessible services for all constituents? | No | The purpose of this project is not to provide a direct public service. |
| Will this project promote open and transparent government with the citizens of the state? | Yes | The purpose of the post election audit is to preserve the integrity of our elections and enhance public confidence in voting technology through rigorous audits. |
| Will this project establish efficient and modern business processes? | Yes | Modernization of our election system and the use of technology to become more efficient is a major priority of the Secretary of the State. |
| Will this project increase accuracy and timeliness of data for policy making, service delivery and results evaluation? | Yes | It is likely to increase the accuracy of the process because human error is an inevitable part of manual audits. |

|  |
| --- |
| 2) What is the expected impact of NOT doing this project? |
| The status quo will remain. 10% of the polling places will still be selected at random to perform manual audits. Towns will continue to pay for necessary labor to perform manual audits. |

|  |
| --- |
| (3) How will you demonstrate achievement of benefits? |
| Success will be measured by the number of towns who upon random selection choose to use the new technology rather than performing a manual audit. |

1. **Statutory/Regulatory Mandates.**  1) Cite and describe federal and state mandates that this project in intended to address. 2) What would be the impact of non-compliance?

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Statutory / Regulatory Mandates: |
| C.G.S. 9-320f outlines the process for selection and performance of manual audits. 9-320 f(g) provides that if the analysis indicated that a tabulator may have failed to properly record votes the Secretary of the State may order an examination and recertification of the tabulators. If the manual audit is not completed as required the town would be referred to State Elections Enforcement for investigation and enforcement. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Impact of non-compliance: |
| Non-compliance with the statutoryily required audit would subject the towns to referral to State Elections Enforcement Commission and possible sanctions. Non-compliance may also erode public confidence in the elections system because citizens will not have confirmation that the electronic tabulators work as designed. |

|  |
| --- |
| Naturally, all citizens are served by ensuring the integrity of our election system. More specifically this project assits towns and election administrators. |

1. **Primary Beneficiaries.**  Who will benefit from this project (citizens businesses, municipalities, other  
   state agencies, staff in your agency, other stakeholders) and in what way?

**Important:**

* **If you have any questions or need assistance completing the form please contact Jim Hadfield or John Vittner**
* **Once you have completed the form and the** [IT Capital Investment Fund Financial Spreadsheet](http://www.ct.gov/opm/lib/opm/finance/itim/investment_brief_financial_spreadsheets_fy13_v4_0.xlsx) **please e-mail them to Jim Hadfield and John Vittner**

John Vittner, (860) 418-6432; [John.Vittner@ct.gov](mailto:John.Vittner@ct.gov)

Jim Hadfield, (860) 418-6438; [Jim.Hadfield@ct.gov](mailto:Jim.Hadfield@ct.gov)