

## BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met remotely in special session through technological means at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, August 12, 2024. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present: Adelita S. Grijalva, Chair  
Rex Scott, Vice Chair  
\*Dr. Matt Heinz, Member  
Dr. Sylvia M. Lee, Member  
Steve Christy, Member

Also Present: Jan Leshar, County Administrator  
Sam Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney  
Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board  
John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

\*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 9:09 a.m.

### 1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### 2. **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT**

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered by Maximo Emiliano Jimenez Lugo, KEYS Research Intern.

### **ELECTIONS**

### 3. **Canvass**

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-642(A) and §16-645(A), canvass of the election results for the July 30, 2024, Primary Election.

Supervisor Scott requested an overview of the processes followed for the canvass.

Constance Hargrove, Director, Elections Department, certified that all voting equipment went through logic and accuracy testing prior to the tabulation of ballots. She explained that there were three tests that took place; one was an in-house logic and accuracy test, and the second was a political party logic and accuracy test, where the political party representatives came in, marked ballots and determined the results. She stated that her department ran their ballots and the representatives verified that the results were correct. She stated that the final logic and accuracy test was through the Secretary of State, which was completed on June 28, 2024. She stated that the equipment passed all tests with no errors and 100% accuracy in counting the ballots. She stated the Recorder's Office issued 183,037 early ballots and 173,614 of those ballots were received and processed by the Elections

Department. She explained that the Elections Department began processing early ballots during the week of July 7, 2024 and once the early ballots were received they began tabulating those ballots with the political party representatives present in each room. She stated that there was a processing room where the ballots were opened and separated, a tabulation room where the ballots were run through a scanner, and an adjudication and write-ins room where the ballots went if the scanners could not read them. She reiterated that the political party representatives were present throughout the entire process. She stated on Election Day all of the vote centers opened at 6:00 a.m. and closed at 7:00 p.m., and none of the vote centers experienced any problems that would have prohibited any voters from casting their ballots. She explained that when the polls closed on Election night the Election Boards returned their ballots to the Receiving stations or to Central Receiving located at the Elections Department. She explained that those ballots were turned into the Boards that represented the Ballot Boards and all other Boards that they had on Election night. She explained that they received the ballots, checked the seals to ensure that the Chain of Custody was kept from the vote centers to the Central counting location. She explained that they filled out documentation with Chain of Custody and ensured that their ballots in the ballot box and any documentation needed for the processors in the tabulation room to tabulate those ballots were provided. She stated that Chain of Custody was checked, ballots were tabulated and results were posted on Election night. She explained that the Elections Department continued to tabulate ballots, such as early ballots that were turned in on Election night, ballots that were received by the Recorder's Office the weekend before or on Election Day, and any provisional ballots. She stated that after all of the ballots were processed there was a post logic and accuracy test done and the political party representatives were present to observe and sign off on that, as well. She stated that during the post processing period while her department prepared documentation for the canvass, she reviewed the documentation that came from the vote centers and compared that information to the Precinct Central, which was a program used to run the electronic poll books. She explained that the documentation received from poll workers and the Boards regarding hand count ballots, the information written down about school and provisional ballots, and the information written down about how many voters came into the centers were checked in and she took that information and compared it to Precinct Central, which was the actual check-in of those voters. She stated that any discrepancies that appeared on the official ballot report, for example, if the count was 50 ballots, but 49 ballots were scanned, that comparison was done from the official ballot report, from the ballots counted to Precinct Central, and if Precinct Central reported only 49 ballots were checked in, then she knew there was a miscount of the ballots. She stated that the comparison was done to verify those ballots matched, however, it could be that they checked in 200 voters and then they had 198 ballots cast, but there was an explanation for what happened. She stated that there were instances when poll workers forgot to change their settings, voters were checked in and issued a provisional ballot as a regular voter and showed up in the total check-in count as regular voters, but they would not have their ballots to count on election night because they were provisional ballots that had to go through a process with the Recorder's Office. She stated that an explanation would be written down and then she could verify the information in Precinct Central that the miscounts were

due to ballots that were checked in as regular voters. She indicated that she followed this process with each vote center to determine if the explanations were valid and when necessary, made telephone calls to get better explanations of what happened on Election Day. She stated that after the completion of this process, she was confident in the accuracy of the Primary Election results and that poll workers followed Chain of Custody with the documents. She stated that there were 197,226 ballots cast for the Primary Election and recommended that the Board certify the results of the election.

Supervisor Scott thanked Ms. Hargrove and her staff for their hard work. He inquired about the three logic and accuracy tests and asked for an expansion of what went into those tests.

Ms. Hargrove responded that the in-house logic and accuracy test consisted of her department preparing ballots, ordering ballots from Runbeck and printing ballots within the Recorder's Office and her department. She explained that once those ballots were printed they were marked and her office had a specified result that they looked for and they took those ballots and ran them through the scanner to ensure that the scanner read them properly. She stated that her department also tested the adjudication portion of the process and the write-in portion to ensure that those were read properly by the scanner and if they were not read properly then those ballots were placed in a tray to be further reviewed and that was checked to ensure it was being done accurately, as well. She explained that if that was done properly then they could adjudicate those ballots and add those to the count. She stated that they also tested the accessible voting equipment, which was the express vote where staff went through checking and patching the ballot for different ballots. She explained that staff casted a ballot for each ballot style and then took those ballots and ran them through the scanner for accuracy. She stated that was done in-house and it was a larger task. She explained that there were many more ballots that they used then for the political party and for the Secretary of State. She clarified that the in-house test was to ensure that the programming was working accurately and would pass any other tests that they had. She stated that the Secretary of State came in and tested the express votes. She explained that they listened to the audio in English and Spanish and casted ballots on the machines and incorporated that into the ballots that they brought with them. She stated that she had no idea which precincts they would test or the ballots that they brought with them to run through the machines.

Supervisor Scott stated that the in-house logic and accuracy test was the most extensive of the three testing types and was a dress rehearsal for what the Elections Department would do later with the political parties and the Secretary of State.

Ms. Hargrove concurred.

Supervisor Scott asked how both mail-in ballots that were verified through the Recorder's Office and the vote center ballots received on Election Day were secured.

Ms. Hargrove responded that Early Board workers were individuals that opened and separated the ballots, and if there were still ballots left to be processed they were locked and secured in a vault in the Early Board's room. She stated that any ballots that were processed were placed into a blue ballot bag with a seal that was documented and then would be placed into an uncounted vault awaiting tabulation. She clarified that those ballots were sealed in a bag and the counts and seal numbers were there. She stated that Election Day ballots were counted on Election night and once they were counted and tabulated, then another seal was placed on the ballot box and they stayed sealed and placed in the vault until the Elections Department could do their hand count audit.

Supervisor Scott stated that in 2011, Pima County became Arizona's 12th county to move from a precinct based model to a vote center model and one of the reasons this was done was to cut down on the number of provisional ballots. He explained that there was still an issue with what was called late earlies, which were early ballots that were dropped off at vote centers on Election Day. He asked if Ms. Hargrove could speak about provisional ballots and late earlies in the Primary and what that could mean for the General Election in November.

Ms. Hargrove responded that 462 provisional ballots were casted at vote centers during this election and she did not believe some of them should have been casted as provisional ballots, but they were. She stated that provisional ballots had decreased significantly and some of them were for people that wanted a ballot for a different party or for no label party individuals who asked for a different ballot issued as a provisional ballot. She explained that late earlies did not decrease, there was still a significant amount of late earlies submitted during this election. She indicated that there were 53,000 late earlies turned in during the last general election and believed the number for this general election would be similar or possibly more for late earlies. She stated that there were 5,322 late earlies dropped off on Election Day.

Supervisor Scott asked if Ms. Hargrove anticipated a higher number in November given the higher participation rate.

Ms. Hargrove responded in the affirmative and that she anticipated her department would receive at least 50,000 or more in late earlies for the General Election. She clarified that with no affect to this canvass things, would slow down in the General Election as far as getting the results in on Election night because those early ballots had to be counted by the vote centers on Election night, in accordance with a new law that was in place.

It was moved by Chair Grijalva and seconded by Supervisor Scott to canvass the election. Upon roll call vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:21 a.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK

DRAFT