



# Electronic Roster Task Force

---

## Findings and Recommendations

Office of Minnesota Secretary of State

1/31/2014

## Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary .....	1
II.	Background .....	2
	A. Enabling Legislation .....	2
	B. Task Force Membership.....	2
	C. Task Force Work Plan.....	4
III.	Research Issues .....	5
	A. Electronic Roster Technology and Direct and Indirect Costs.....	5
	B. Use and Reliability of Department of Vehicle Services Photos and the Ability to Add Photos to the Electronic Roster on Election Day .....	8
	C. Data Security in Electronic Rosters and the Ability to Connect Rosters Throughout the State .....	8
	D. Additional Information Requested by the Task Force .....	9
IV.	Findings and Recommendations.....	10
	A. The legislature should authorize a 2014 electronic roster study.....	10
	B. The legislature should appropriate funds to offset the costs of the 2014 electronic roster study for local election officials. ....	11
	C. Minimum functionality requirements should be set for 2014 electronic roster study electronic rosters and any other electronic rosters.....	11
	D. Minimum data security requirements should be set for electronic rosters. ....	12
	E. No photos should be used in electronic rosters.....	13
	F. The legislature should appropriate funds provide for a formal evaluation of the 2014 electronic roster study. ....	13
	G. The state should engage in a “build or buy” electronic roster software analysis.....	13
V.	Draft Legislation.....	14
	Appendices.....	i

- A. Enabling Legislation ..... i
- B. July 9, 2013 Meeting Materials.....v
- C. September 12, 2013 Meeting Materials.....x
- D. October 9, 2013 Meeting Materials .....xiii
- E. October 21, 2013 Meeting Materials .....xxxix
- F. December 9, 2013 Meeting Materials.....xliii
- G. January 9, 2014 Meeting Materials .....xlvi

## I. Executive Summary

Under the 2013 omnibus elections bill (Chapter 131) signed into law by Gov. Dayton in May, 2013, the legislature established a 15-member task force to study electronic rosters. Electronic rosters, also known as “electronic poll books” or “ePollbooks,” are an electronic version of the paper polling place roster. The Electronic Roster Task Force was required to examine the potential for use of electronic rosters in Minnesota.

At the same time that the task force was conducting its review, the legislature also authorized a 2013 electronic roster pilot project to explore the use of electronic rosters in conducting elections. Jurisdictions participating in the project could use electronic rosters to process election day registration, to verify the registration status of preregistered voters, or both. The electronic roster pilot project occurred in five cities across three counties. Although the electronic roster pilot project does not report to the legislature officially until January 31, 2014, the Electronic Roster Task Force heard reports at various stages throughout the pilot.

Following the Electronic Roster Task Force’s examination of the statutorily-required issues, and following reports from the electronic roster pilot project, the task force recommends the following:

- The legislature should authorize a study to be conducted during the 2014 general election.
- The legislature should appropriate funds to offset the costs of the 2014 electronic roster study for local election officials.
- Minimum functionality requirements should be set for 2014 electronic roster study electronic rosters and any other electronic rosters.
- Minimum data security requirements should be set for electronic rosters.
- No photos should be used in electronic rosters at this time.
- The legislature should appropriate funds provide for a formal evaluation of the 2014 electronic roster study.

Although the task force recommends an additional study for the 2014 election, the task force notes that nothing prevents a jurisdiction from using electronic rosters so long as the electronic rosters comply with Minnesota law.

## **II. Background**

### ***A. Enabling Legislation***

The Electronic Roster Task Force was established by the Minnesota Legislature in 2013. See 2013 Minn. Laws, Ch. 131, Art. 4, Sec. 2. The enabling legislation specifically outlined the duties of the task force, stating:

The task force must research the following issues:

- (1) electronic roster technology, including different types of electronic rosters;
- (2) the ability to use photographs received from the Department of Vehicle Services;
- (3) the ability to add photographs to the roster on election day;
- (4) data security in electronic rosters, the statewide voter registration system, and the Department of Vehicle Services;
- (5) reliability of Department of Vehicle Services data, including the ability to match names and photographs without duplication;
- (6) ability of precincts across the state to connect an electronic roster to a secure network to access the statewide voter registration system; and
- (7) direct and indirect costs associated with using electronic rosters.

2013 Minn. Laws, Ch. 131, Art. 4, Sec. 2, Subd. 3. The enabling legislation did not specify the number and frequency of task force meetings, but instead required that the task force meet for the first time no later than July 1, 2013, and submit a final report no later than January 31, 2014. The enabling legislation requires the report to be submitted to the “chairs and ranking minority members of the committees in the senate and house of representatives with primary jurisdiction over elections, summarizing [the task force’s] findings and listing recommendations on the implementation of electronic rosters statewide. The report shall include draft legislation to implement the recommendations of the task force.” 2013 Minn. Laws, Ch. 131, Art. 4, Sec. 2, Subd. 7.

The Legislative Coordinating Commission provided staff support, as needed, to facilitate the task force’s work. 2013 Minn. Laws, Ch. 131, Art. 4, Sec. 2, Subd. 6.

### ***B. Task Force Membership***

The task force consisted of fifteen members, and the membership of the task force was established by the legislature. Membership consists of elections officials and staff from local governments, state departments and the Legislature. The governor had authority to appoint

three individuals: two election judges and one person familiar with electronic roster technology. No member was permitted to represent, nor have a financial interest in, a specific vendor of the technology.

The Electronic Roster Task Force consists of the following 15 members:

- The director of the Department of Public Safety, Division of Vehicle Services, or designee: **Pat McCormack**;
- The secretary of state, or designee: **Secretary of State Mark Ritchie**;
- An individual designated by the secretary of state, from the elections division in the Office of the Secretary of State: Elections Director **Gary Poser**;
- The chief information officer of the state of Minnesota, or designee; **Commissioner Carolyn Parnell**;
- One county auditor appointed by the Minnesota Association of County Officers: **Debby Erickson**, Crow Wing County;
- One town election official appointed by the Minnesota Association of Townships: **Barb Welty**, Kathio Township;
- One city election official appointed by the League of Minnesota Cities: **David Maeda**, City of Minnetonka;
- One school district election official appointed by the Minnesota School Boards Association: **Grace Wachlarowicz**;
- One representative appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives: **Rep. Carolyn Laine** (DFL – Columbia Heights);
- One representative appointed by the minority leader of the house of representatives: **Rep. Tim O’Driscoll** (R - Sartell);
- One senator appointed by the senate Subcommittee on Committees of the Committee on Rules and Administration: **Sen. Terri Bonoff** (DFL – Minnetonka);
- One senator appointed by the senate minority leader: **Sen. Mary Kiffmeyer** (R- Big Lake);

- One person appointed by the governor, familiar with electronic roster technology but who does not represent a specific vendor of the technology: **Max Hailperin**; and
- Two election judges appointed by the governor: **Vaughn Bodelson** and **Kathy Bonnifield**.

At the first meeting of the Task Force, the Task Force elected Secretary Ritchie as Task Force chair and Debby Erickson as Task Force vice-chair.

### ***C. Task Force Work Plan***

On the first meeting of the Electronic Roster Task Force, the task force adopted a work plan in order to ensure that the task force examined each of the statutorily-required issues. The task force ultimately held nine meetings, with meetings two and three being an extended four-hour combined meeting.

In accordance with the work plan and the statutorily-required research issues, the task force meetings had the following foci:

#### **Meeting 1 (July 9, 2013)**

Focus:

- Organizational Meeting
- Overview of ways electronic rosters have been used

#### **Meetings 2 & 3 (September 12, 2013)**

Focus:

- Electronic roster technology, including different types of electronic rosters

#### **Meeting 4 (October 9, 2013)**

Focus:

- Data security in electronic rosters, the statewide voter registration system
- Ability of precincts across the state to connect an electronic roster to a secure network to access the statewide voter registration system

### **Meeting 5 (October 21, 2013)**

Focus:

- Reliability of Department of Vehicle Services data, including the ability to match names and photographs without duplication

### **Meetings 6 (November 15, 2013)**

Focus:

- The ability to use photographs received from the Department of Vehicle Services
- Data security in the Department of Vehicle Services
- The ability to add photographs to the roster on election day

### **Meeting 7 (December 9, 2013)**

Focus:

- Synthesis of discussions
- Task force recommendations

### **Meeting 8 (January 9, 2014)**

Focus:

- Review of draft recommendations and discussion

### **Meeting 9 – Final Meeting (January 30, 2014)**

Focus:

- Approval of final report, recommendations and draft legislation

The agendas, meeting minutes, and any accompanying hand-outs for each meeting are included in the appendix of this report.

## **III. Research Issues**

### ***A. Electronic Roster Technology and Direct and Indirect Costs***

The task force was required to research “electronic roster technology, including different types of electronic rosters” and the “direct and indirect costs associated with using electronic

rosters.” 2013 Minn. Laws, Ch. 131, Art. 4, Sec. 2, Subd. 3(1) and (6). The task force researched these issues through various presentations including presentations by electronic roster vendors.

Max Hailperin, a Gustavus Adolphus Professor, presented an overview of the current use of electronic rosters for pre-registered voters in other states. Professor Hailperin reported that the most basic use of electronic rosters across the country was for the purpose of checking in pre-registered voters, but even the basic electronic rosters often contained additional functionality. Electronic rosters generally serve what Professor Hailperin noted as the three core functions served now by paper rosters:

- (1) support some portion of eligibility checking, including that the voter is registered, that the voter has not yet voted in this election, and that there are no challenges to the voter;
- (2) allows for the collection and posting of voter history following the election; and
- (3) serving as an audit trail.

Professor Hailperin reported that some jurisdictions use electronic rosters to serve all three functions of a paper roster, while others have chosen to use a paper system for the audit-trail portion of the roster function. For those jurisdictions using electronic rosters at the precinct level, Professor Hailperin noted that there is often networking within the polling location but that there is generally no need to network outside of the polling location.

David Maeda, City Clerk for the City of Minnetonka, presented an overview of the history and use of electronic poll books in the City of Minnetonka, including the use of electronic rosters for election day registration. The City of Minnetonka has been using electronic rosters beginning in 2009, and the Mr. Maeda reported that – due to the higher number of election day registrations – the benefits of the electronic rosters in the city are most obvious during the even-year statewide elections.

Mr. Maeda reported the following benefits from the use of electronic rosters for pre-registered voters:

- Eliminating hand marking AB on rosters by uploading updated data prior to election day
- Voter line and traffic management- eliminates need to break rosters up by alphabet and allows next voter in line to go to any of the election judges using an electronic roster
- Prevents voters from seeing any voter information other than their own
- Greatly reduces chance voter will sign on the wrong signature line in roster
- Greeter’s list/precinct finder can be loaded on hand held device

- Robust search function to find voter in pollbook (search similar names, search by address, etc.)
- Provides greater clarity for election judges in precincts that fall into multiple school districts ensuring voter gets correct ballot
- Provides information for election judge staffing by tracking the number of voters throughout day
- Eliminates counting signatures on roster or voter receipts allowing for a more accurate reconciliation process
- Voter history data can be electronically updated once programming is completed in SVRS by 2014

Mr. Maeda also reported the following benefits from the use of electronic rosters for election day registration:

- Verification that all requirements are met (age, residence in precinct, proof of residence) and form completed
- If voucher is used, verifies a voucher is registered voter in precinct and tracks number of voters one voucher has vouched for
- Automates (and expedites) filling out VRA
- Could allow printing of a map to give to voter who has shown up in wrong polling location
- Provides greater clarity for election judges in precincts that fall into multiple school districts ensuring voter gets correct ballot
- Once SVRS is programmed for the 2013 pilot project, will allow for electronic data to be directly uploaded into statewide voter registration system
- More accurate voter records- less data entry required, no guessing at bad handwriting; quicker processing after elections

Following the presentations by David Maeda and Max Hailperin, the task force heard a presentation from Dennis Parrot, Jasper County Auditor, and Ken Kline, Cerro Gordo County Auditor, who presented an overview and demonstration of Precinct Atlas, the precinct election management system developed and built by Cerro Gordo County in Iowa and now in use in over half of the counties in Iowa.

The task force invited vendors of electronic roster software to present at the task force meetings. Over three meetings the task force heard presentations from six electronic roster vendors on the technology and costs and potential cost savings associated with electronic rosters. The vendors also were asked, and presented on, the reliability and data security of their electronic roster.

Following these presentations the task force engaged in a discussion of electronic roster technology including the different types of technology, the reliability of rosters, data security, costs and cost-savings associated with rosters, benefits of electronic roster technology and the feasibility of using electronic rosters in both state and municipal elections.

### ***B. Use and Reliability of Department of Vehicle Services Photos and the Ability to Add Photos to the Electronic Roster on Election Day***

The task force was required to research “the ability to use photographs received from the Department of Vehicle Services;” “the ability to add photographs to the roster on election day;” “data security in . . . the Department of Vehicle Services;” and “the reliability of Department of Vehicle Services data, including the ability to match names and photographs without duplication.” 2013 Minn. Laws, Ch. 131, Art. 4, Sec. 2, Subd. 3(2), (3), (4) and (5).

To examine the reliability of Department of Vehicle Services data and the ability to add photos taken on election day to a roster, the task force heard presentations from both a national expert on driver’s license facial recognition and driver’s license fraud, as well as presentations from the Minnesota Driver and Vehicle Services Division on the facial recognition work that the department is already doing. The task force first heard a presentation by Geoff Slagle with the American Association of Motor Vehicles. Mr. Slagle presented an overview on the use of facial recognition software nationwide, the various types of facial recognition systems, and the various factors that can affect the accuracy of facial recognition software.

Pat McCormack, Director of Driver and Vehicle Services, Minnesota Department of Public Safety, next presented an overview on the DPS Driver and Vehicle Services Division Facial Recognition Project. Pat McCormack presented on the development of a Facial Recognition team in DPS, slated to hire a director beginning in fiscal year 2014, and the capacity of DPS Driver and Vehicle Services in light of the projected 2017 MNLARS completion date.

In order to research the issues of Driver and Vehicle Services data security and using photos from Driver and Vehicle Services in electronic rosters on election day, the task force heard a presentation from Pat McCormack, Director of Driver and Vehicle Services, Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Paul Meekin, CIO MN.IT Services, and Joe Newton, General Counsel, Minnesota Department of Public Safety. The presentation provided an overview of current DVS data-security requirements, the current use of DVS photographs, and the security considerations that would arise if DVS photographs were available in polling places on election day.

### ***C. Data Security in Electronic Rosters and the Ability to Connect Rosters Throughout the State***

The task force was required to research “data security in electronic rosters [and] the statewide voter registration system” and “the ability of precincts across the state to connect an electronic

roster to a secure network to access the statewide voter registration system.” 2013 Minn. Laws, Ch. 131, Art. 4, Sec. 2, Subd. 3(4) and (6).

The task force researched this issue by hearing presentations from the Office of Secretary of State’s Elections Director Gary Poser and IT staff Matt McCullough. The presentation covered the data contained in the Statewide Voter Registration System, the data provided to election judges in paper rosters, the current security in place regarding the Statewide Voter Registration System, and the security and technological challenges of allowing all polling locations to have access to the Statewide Voter Registration System on election day. Other task force members also discussed internet connectivity issues both in urban and greater Minnesota polling locations.

#### ***D. Additional Information Requested by the Task Force***

In addition to the legislatively required research topics, the task force also requested and heard several presentations regarding the 2013 electronic roster pilot project. The task force heard presentations regarding the status of the pilot prior to the November 2013 election, several task force members visited polling locations participating in the 2013 pilot on election day, and the task force heard presentations regarding the experiences of the voters, election judges, and participating counties and municipalities following the 2013 election. County elections officials reported varying experiences across vendors, and Ramsey County election officials reported that voters generally were either impressed by the technology or regarded it as a needless fix to a system that was already working.

As part of these discussions, the task force requested information regarding the Statewide Voter Registration System programming required for the 2013 pilot project. The Office of Secretary of State reported that programming to allow uniform processing of election day registrations from electronic rosters to the Statewide Voter Registration System had been completed, but that the office was not able to complete the programming for the downloading and uploading of pre-registered voter data from electronic rosters to the Statewide Voter Registration System. The Office of Secretary of State reported that it was able to provide file formats to both download and upload pre-registered voter data, but that the programming necessary standardize the download and upload of data would not be completed until the November 2014 election.

The task force also requested additional information regarding the use of electronic rosters in other states. The Office of Secretary of State’s Election Director, Gary Poser, sent a survey to all state elections directors asking for additional information regarding any state use of electronic rosters. Twenty-eight states responded to the survey, with 19 states reporting allowing the use of electronic rosters, three states prohibiting the use of electronic rosters, and one state requiring the use of electronic rosters. The other states reporting either voted entirely by mail or were in the process of discussing the use of electronic rosters.

Following these presentations, the task force moved to the discussion of recommendations for the state legislature.

## **IV. Findings and Recommendations**

### ***A. The legislature should authorize a 2014 electronic roster study.***

The task force recommends an expanded electronic roster study for the 2014 general election. The task force recommends a new study in 2014 because the 2013 pilot project was limited in scale, required a time-consuming duplicative sign-in process for voters, and occurred only in low-turnout municipal elections. Additional information can be gained from a 2014 study that would help inform counties and municipalities about the potential benefits of electronic rosters. The task force recommends that the 2014 study not only test the electronic rosters in a high-volume general election but to also make substantive changes to the 2013 pilot to provide additional information that will assist counties and municipalities in assessing whether or not electronic rosters would provide benefits and cost-savings in their election administration.

The task force recommends that the 2014 study include a paper back-up system approved by the Office of Secretary of State, but remove the requirement in place in the 2013 pilot that voters and election judges utilize duplicative-registration processes. The 2013 pilot project participants reported to the task force that duplicative sign-in process was burdensome to both election judges and voters, and the task force recommends that the legislature not require the duplicate sign-in process used in the 2013 pilot. In participating jurisdictions in the 2014 study, voters would sign in or register only using the electronic roster. The paper back-up system would only be used in the case of a failure of the electronic roster.

Because the 2013 pilot was limited to those municipalities conducting elections in 2013, the task force recommends an expansion of the participating municipalities for the 2014 pilot. The task force recommends including additional municipalities to ensure that the 2014 pilot contains municipalities that provide the pilot with diverse municipalities considering: geographic location, population density, and same-day registration prevalence.

The task force recommends that 2014 study would also include those municipalities that participated in the 2013 pilot. These municipalities have the benefit of learning from their experience in the 2013 pilot, and including these municipalities in the 2014 study will ensure the 2014 study includes municipalities and county elections officials with experience using electronic roster technology. If a municipality that participated in the 2013 pilot chooses to withdraw from participation in the 2014 study, the withdrawing municipality's county may choose another similarly sized municipality within the county to replace the withdrawing municipality.

The task force notes that, though the task force is not recommending statewide implementation of electronic rosters, nothing prevents a municipality from using electronic rosters generally. In order to ensure efficient election administration, the task force recommends that the legislature require any municipality choosing to use electronic rosters in the 2014 election to notify the Office of Secretary of State of the intent to use electronic rosters by August 1, 2014.

***B. The legislature should appropriate funds to offset the costs of the 2014 electronic roster study for local election officials.***

The 2013 electronic roster pilot did not include any funds for participating municipalities to offset the costs associated with the pilot. Because there are fewer elections across the country in the odd years, vendors had both the time and resources to provide pilot materials for free to participating municipalities. Even with these free materials, some municipalities expended their own funds in order to rent additional electronic rosters to ensure that they had a number that the municipality felt was sufficient in order to properly service voters.

In light of the importance of the 2014 election, and in light of the likelihood that vendors will not have the resources in 2014 to provide all of the needed materials and technical support for free, the legislature should provide funds to offset the costs incurred by the counties and municipalities participating in the 2014 study.

***C. Minimum functionality requirements should be set for 2014 electronic roster study electronic rosters and any other electronic rosters.***

The task force recommends that counties should be able to select their own vendors for the 2014 election, but the electronic rosters should meet certain minimum requirements, similar to those used in the 2013 pilot:

- (1) Be able to be loaded with a data file that includes voter registration data in a file format prescribed by the secretary of state;
- (2) Allow for data to be exported in a file format prescribed by the secretary of state;
- (3) Allow for data to be entered manually or by scanning a Minnesota driver's license or identification card to locate a voter record or populate a voter registration application that would be printed and signed and dated by the voter. The printed registration application can be either a printed form, labels printed with voter information to be affixed to a pre-printed form, or a combination of both;
- (4) Allow an election judge to update data that was populated from a scanned driver's license or identification card;

- (5) Cue an election judge to ask for and input data that is not populated from a scanned driver's license or identification card that is otherwise required to be collected from the voter or an election judge;
- (6) Immediately alert the election judge if the voter has provided information that indicates that the voter is not eligible to vote;
- (7) Immediately alert the election judge if the electronic poll book indicates that a voter has already voted in that precinct, the voter's registration status is challenged, or it appears the voter resides in a different precinct;
- (8) Provide immediate instructions on how to resolve a particular type of challenge when a voter's record is challenged;
- (9) Provide for a printed voter's signature certificate, containing the voter's name, address of residence, date of birth, voter identification number, the oath required by Minnesota Statutes, section 204C.10, and a space for the voter's original signature. The printed certificate can be either a printed form or a label printed with the voter's information to be affixed to the oath; and
- (10) Perform any other functions necessary for the efficient and secure administration of participating election, as determined by the secretary of state.

If any jurisdiction not participating in the electronic roster study wishes to use electronic rosters in the 2014 election, the task force recommends that those jurisdictions must certify to the Office of Secretary of State that their electronic rosters meet the minimum requirements. This certification must be provided to the Office of Secretary of State by October 1, 2014.

#### ***D. Minimum data security requirements should be set for electronic rosters.***

The task force recommends that minimum security standards be set for the 2014 electronic roster study and for any other electronic roster used in the 2014 election. The task force first recommends that the voter data loaded on electronic rosters be limited to only pre-registered voters within that precinct.

The task force recommends that municipalities select the electronic rosters of their choice, including electronic rosters that connect to printers in a wired or wireless means, but minimum security standards established by the Office of Secretary of State, in consultation with MN.IT, would have to be met.

The task force makes no recommendation regarding whether an electronic roster must be a dedicated electronic roster, or if the device could be used for other functions following the election. It would be up to the municipalities to decide if the electronic rosters would be devices dedicated exclusively to use as an electronic roster or could be used for other functions,

but the task force recommends minimum security standards for multi-purpose hardware be established by the Office of Secretary of State, in consultation with MN.IT.

In order to ensure the security of voter data, the task force recommends limiting the ability of electronic rosters to be networked on election day. On election day, the task force recommends that the electronic rosters may be networked to each other within the polling place, but would be prohibited from being connected to any device outside of the polling place.

***E. No photos should be used in electronic rosters.***

At this time, the task force does not recommend that photos be incorporated into electronic rosters.

***F. The legislature should appropriate funds provide for a formal evaluation of the 2014 electronic roster study.***

The task force recommends that the legislature appropriate funds for a study of the 2014 electronic roster study, including empirical data regarding the time spent by pre-registered voters and same-day registrants using the electronic roster on election day. The study must also gather data regarding the time spent by counties processing voter data post-election. In gathering data, the study must examine both those municipalities participating in the 2014 electronic roster study and comparable municipalities using paper rosters in the 2014 election.

***G. The state should engage in a “build or buy” electronic roster software analysis.***

The task force recommends that the legislature authorize and fund a “build or buy” analysis. The analysis would be conducted by the Office of the Secretary of State in conjunction with MN.IT, and in consultation with the Minnesota Association of County Officers and the League of Cities. This analysis should be provided to the legislature by April 1, 2015.

## V. Draft Legislation

1.1 A bill for an act

1.2 relating to elections; providing a study of the use of electronic rosters in elections;  
1.3 requiring secretary of state to evaluate electronic rosters in 2014 election.

1.4 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

1.5 Section 1. **ELECTRONIC ROSTER STUDY.**

1.6 Subdivision 1. **Established.** A study is established to explore the use of electronic  
1.7 rosters in conducting elections. Jurisdictions participating in the study must use  
1.8 electronic rosters to process election day registration and to verify the registration status  
1.9 of preregistered voters. The study shall apply to the 2014 state general election. The  
1.10 standards for conducting the study are provided in this section.

1.11 Subd. 2. **Participating municipalities.** Precincts located in Dilworth, Minnetonka,  
1.12 Moorhead, Saint Anthony, and Saint Paul may participate in the study. In participating  
1.13 municipalities, the head elections official may designate individual precincts in the  
1.14 jurisdiction to participate. A city is not required to use electronic rosters in all precincts.

1.15 Subd. 3. **Technology requirements.** In participating precincts, an electronic roster  
1.16 must:

1.17 (1) be able to be loaded with a data file that includes voter registration data in a file  
1.18 format prescribed by the secretary of state;

1.19 (2) allow for data to be exported in a file format prescribed by the secretary of state;

1.20 (3) allow for data to be entered manually or by scanning a Minnesota driver's license  
1.21 or identification card to locate a voter record or populate a voter registration application  
1.22 that would be printed and signed and dated by the voter. The printed registration  
1.23 application can be either a printed form, labels printed with voter information to be affixed  
1.24 to a preprinted form, or a combination of both;

2.1 (4) allow an election judge to update data that was populated from a scanned driver's  
 2.2 license or identification card;

2.3 (5) cue an election judge to ask for and input data that is not populated from a  
 2.4 scanned driver's license or identification card that is otherwise required to be collected  
 2.5 from the voter or an election judge;

2.6 (6) immediately alert the election judge if the voter has provided information that  
 2.7 indicates that the voter is not eligible to vote;

2.8 (7) immediately alert the election judge if the electronic roster indicates that a voter  
 2.9 has already voted in that precinct, the voter's registration status is challenged, or it appears  
 2.10 the voter resides in a different precinct;

2.11 (8) provide immediate instructions on how to resolve a particular type of challenge  
 2.12 when a voter's record is challenged;

2.13 (9) provide for a printed voter's signature certificate, containing the voter's name,  
 2.14 address of residence, date of birth, voter identification number, the oath required by  
 2.15 Minnesota Statutes, section 204C.10, and a space for the voter's original signature.  
 2.16 The printed certificate can be either a printed form or a label printed with the voter's  
 2.17 information to be affixed to the oath;

2.18 (10) contain only preregistered voters within the precinct, and not contain  
 2.19 preregistered voter data on voters registered outside of the precinct;

2.20 (11) be only networked within the polling location on election day;

2.21 (12) meet minimum security standards established by the Office of the Secretary  
 2.22 of State in consultation with MN.IT; and

2.23 (13) perform any other functions necessary for the efficient and secure administration  
 2.24 of the participating election, as determined by the secretary of state.

2.25 Subd. 4. **Minnesota election law; other law.** Except as provided in this section,  
 2.26 the provisions of the Minnesota Election Law apply to this study, so far as practicable.  
 2.27 Voters participating in the safe at home program must be allowed to vote pursuant to  
 2.28 Minnesota Statutes, section 5B.06. Nothing in this section shall be construed to amend  
 2.29 absentee voting provisions in Minnesota Statutes, chapter 203B.

2.30 Subd. 5. **Election records retention.** All voter's signature certificates and voter  
 2.31 registration applications printed from an electronic roster must be retained pursuant  
 2.32 to Minnesota Statutes, section 204B.40. The electronic rosters must print signature  
 2.33 certificates and voter registration applications on material that will remain legible through  
 2.34 the period prescribed by Minnesota Statutes, section 204B.40. Data on election day  
 2.35 registrants and voter history must be uploaded to the statewide voter registration system  
 2.36 for processing by county auditors.

3.1 Subd. 6. **Election day.** Participating precincts must use electronic rosters for  
3.2 election day registration and to process preregistered voters.

3.3 Subd. 7. **Evaluation.** The secretary of state must requisition an empirical evaluation  
3.4 of the use of electronic rosters in the 2014 state general election. The evaluation must  
3.5 also gather data regarding the time spent by municipalities processing voter data after  
3.6 the election. In gathering data, the evaluation must examine both those municipalities  
3.7 participating in the 2014 electronic roster study and comparable municipalities using paper  
3.8 rosters in the 2014 state general election.

3.9 Subd. 8. **Build or buy analysis.** The secretary of state, in conjunction with MN.IT  
3.10 and in consultation with the Minnesota Association of County Officers and League of  
3.11 Minnesota Cities, must engage in an analysis of the merits of a state-built electronic roster  
3.12 system or purchasing an electronic roster system from private vendors. This analysis must  
3.13 be presented to the chairs and ranking minority members of the committees in the senate  
3.14 and house of representatives with primary jurisdiction over elections by April 2015.

3.15 Subd. 9. **Use of electronic rosters in nonparticipating municipalities.** Nothing in  
3.16 this section prevents a nonparticipating municipality from using electronic rosters in the  
3.17 2014 election. In order to use electronic rosters in the 2014 election, a nonparticipating  
3.18 municipality must notify the Office of the Secretary of State by August 1, 2014, of the  
3.19 municipality's intent to use electronic rosters and must certify to the Office of the Secretary  
3.20 of State by October 1, 2014, that the electronic rosters meet all of the requirements in  
3.21 subdivision 3.

3.22 Subd. 10. **Expiration.** The authorization for this study expires upon submission  
3.23 of the report as provided in subdivision 8.