Secretary of State
KEVIN SHELLEY
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PARALLEL MONITORING PROGRAM

California

GENERAL ELECTION

Tuesday, November 2, 2004

REPORT OF FINDINGS

PREPARED BY:

R&G ASSOCIATES, LLC

NOVEMBER 30, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendices

Parallel Monitoring Program
General Election
November 2, 2004
Report of Findings

Executive Summary

Introduction

The use of Direct Recording Electronic (DRE), including touch screen voting systems, gave rise to public concerns about the security of these systems. The principle concern expressed has been the possibility that unauthorized programmers could illegally manipulate the software that counts ballots on DRE equipment.

On April 30, 2004, Secretary of State Kevin Shelley directed that a county use no DRE voting system unless the county agreed to implement a series of security measures. One of the required security measures was the Parallel Monitoring Program (Program), originally proposed by his Ad Hoc Touch Screen Task Force appointed in February of 2003. The Program was first implemented in the March 2004 Presidential Primary Election.

Members of the Secretary of State Elections Division staff, along with independent consultants from the consulting firm of R&G Associates, LLC (R&G), developed the Program to implement the Secretary's directive. The Program provided for the random selection of DRE voting equipment to be set aside for use by experts to test on Election Day, simulating actual voting conditions, to determine the accuracy of the machines to record, tabulate, and report votes.

Program Purpose

Current federal, state, and county accuracy testing of Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting systems occurs prior to elections and does not mirror actual voting conditions. The March Parallel Monitoring Program was developed as a supplement to the current logic and accuracy testing processes. The goal was to determine the presence of malicious code by testing the accuracy of the machines to record, tabulate, and report votes using a sample of DRE equipment in selected counties under simulated voting conditions on Election Day.

Notwithstanding this additional level of testing, there are forms of malicious code that could affect the accuracy of a voting system that would not be detected by federal, state, local or parallel testing. Other detection methods, such as the Accessible Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail (AVVPAT), are necessary to expose these types of election tampering.

The Program results provide a "snapshot" of a specific system's behavior on Election Day. Thus, the value of the results is limited to the November 2, 2004 Election Day.

Program Scope

Eleven counties agreed to the conditions set forth in the Secretary's Directive and utilized DRE equipment for the November 2, 2004 election. Of these, one county—Los Angeles—was excluded from the Program because it used DRE equipment for early voting and not in the precincts on Election Day.

The ten participating counties provided the opportunity to sample the four different DRE systems currently approved for use in California: Diebold AccuVote TS, ES&S iVotronic, Hart eSlate, and Sequoia AVC Edge.

Two DRE units were tested in each of the ten counties. Within each of the counties one precinct was identified for testing purposes. The official ballot of the selected precinct provided the foundation for the development of test scripts used in that county. The ten counties selected for the Program were:

- Alameda
- Merced
- Napa
- Orange
- Plumas
- Riverside
- San Bernardino
- Santa Clara
- Shasta
- Tehama

Program Requisites

Security of the testing process in each of the selected counties was of paramount consideration. In order to be successful, the Program required that:

1. The counties agree to the conditions set forth in the Secretary's Directive, dated April 30, 2004.
2. The counties agree to host testing teams on November 2, 2004.
3. Selection of voting equipment in each of the counties be randomly determined, utilizing random number generator computer software to eliminate human error or bias.
4. Voting equipment be fully operational, prepared for the November 2, 2004 Election by the county and accessible for selection prior to November 2nd and for testing on November 2nd.
5. A secure storage area be available at each county to house the selected voting equipment prior to November 2, 2004.
6. Tamper evident serially numbered security seals be placed on the selected voting machines.
7. A secure, appropriately equipped testing room be available at each county for the testing team on November 2, 2004.

8. A county representative be available to assist or provide guidance on logistical issues, while the team was in the county prior to, and on November 2, 2004.
9. Testing on November 2, 2004, be conducted by the testing teams without the involvement of voting system vendors.

Program Methodology

A test methodology was created to provide a framework for developing test scripts, defining the roles and training the testers, observers and team leaders, documenting testing activity and discrepancy reporting, equipment security and tracking test artifacts.

Test scripts served as the tool to achieve the main goal of validating the accuracy of the DRE equipment. Test scripts were designed to mimic the actual voter experience. Each script represented the attributes of a voter (party affiliation, language choice) and specified a candidate for which the tester should vote in a specific contest. The test script form was laid out to record requisite details of the voting process for a "test voter" and served as a means to tally test votes and assist in verifying if all votes were properly recorded, summarized, and reported by the DRE unit.

For each county, 101 test scripts were developed. All contests, contest participants, voter demographics, script layouts and contents, and monitoring results were entered into a MS Access™ database. The database was a tool to manage 242 contests, over 1,000 contest participants and approximately 52,000 test voter selections from over 1,000 test scripts. The database also served as a tool to verify the accuracy and completeness of the test scripts.

Test Team Composition

Testing teams were comprised of 62 individuals including eighteen Secretary of State employees, twenty-three consultant testers, and twenty-one video operators. With the exception of the video operators, each team member received four and a half hours of Parallel Monitoring Program training. Team leaders received two and a half additional hours of training specifically focused on team leader responsibilities.

Test Execution

Test teams were scheduled to arrive at their assigned county at varied times on the morning of November 2, 2004, to meet with county representatives, retrieve the voting equipment from storage, and be escorted to the testing room. Test teams followed a specific test schedule that identified set times for executing the 101 test scripts on each DRE unit. The schedule provided for 9.25 hours of testing over a 13-hour period. All testing activity was video recorded.

During the course of the testing, the teams completed a discrepancy report for each deviation from the test script and/or test process and for any issues related to equipment malfunction.

At the completion of the testing, teams produced the closing tally report for their assigned DRE unit. The test teams did not reconcile the tally tapes in the field and had no knowledge of the expected outcomes.

Parallel Monitoring Program Results

The analysis of the data and the reconciliation of actual to expected results began on November 3, 2004. The analysis included a review of the discrepancy reports for all counties and the videotapes, as necessary, to determine the source of all discrepancies.

Results of the reconciliation analysis indicate that the DRE equipment tested on November 2, 2004 recorded the votes as cast with 100% accuracy.

Parallel Monitoring Program
General Election
November 2, 2004
Report of Findings

I. Introduction

In March 2002 California voters enacted the Voting Modernization Bond Act, establishing a fund of $200 million for counties to upgrade voting equipment. Concurrently, the federal Help America Vote Act of 2002(HAVA) was enacted by Congress and signed into law by the President requiring election reform and funding for improvements.

These actions provided incentives for counties to purchase Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting equipment, including touch screen voting systems. The adoption of touch screen voting systems gave rise to public concerns about the security of these systems. The principle concern expressed has been the possibility that unauthorized programmers could illegally manipulate the software that records ballots on DRE equipment.

In response to the above concerns, Secretary of State Kevin Shelley created the Ad Hoc Touch Screen Task Force on February 19, 2003 to study and make recommendations to the Secretary on possible improvements in the security of DRE voting equipment. Among other recommendations, the Task Force recommended:

> "Conducting random on-site sampling (otherwise known as 'parallel monitoring') of a specific number of machines on Election Day to confirm that each system in operation is registering votes accurately."

A. March 2004 Parallel Monitoring Program

On February 5, 2004, Secretary of State Kevin Shelley directed counties using DRE voting systems to take additional security measures for the March 2004 Primary Election (see Appendix A – Security Measures for Touch Screen (DRE) Voting Systems for the March Election). One of the required security measures was the conduct of a Parallel Monitoring Program to be performed under the auspices of the Secretary of State. The Parallel Monitoring Program would determine the accuracy of the machines to record, tabulate and report votes, by randomly selecting a sample of DRE units, to be set aside for testing by experts. The test would simulate actual voting conditions, on Election Day, to determine the accuracy of the machines to record, tabulate, and report votes.

Members of the Secretary of State Elections Division staff, along with independent consultants, developed a Parallel Monitoring Program to implement the Secretary's directive for the March 2, 2004 Election. Eight of the fourteen counties using DREs in the election were selected for testing. The March Parallel Monitoring Program Report is available on the Secretary of State's website.

B. The November 2, 2004 General Election Program

The Voting Systems and Procedures Panel, charged with making recommendations to the Secretary regarding voting systems, held a public hearing on April 21, 22 and 28, 2004, regarding the use of various voting systems in the November 2004 General Election. Following the hearing, Secretary Shelley decertified the Diebold AccuVote TSx touch screen voting system used in four counties in the March 2004 Primary Election. For the remaining election counties using other DRE voting systems, the Secretary Shelley provided that those systems used in the March 2, 2004 Statewide Primary Election, would be approved for use in the November 2, 2004 General Election, if the counties complied with a set of conditions set forth in a Directive by his Office, dated April 30, 2004 (see Appendix B – Decertification and Withdrawal of Approval of Certain DRE Voting Systems and Conditional Approval of the Use of Certain DRE Voting Systems). One of the conditions for use of the DRE voting system included, participation in the Parallel Monitoring Program.

In a memo of clarification, dated May 14, 2004, to the affected County Registrars of Voters, titled "Clarification of Conditions for using Electronic Voting Machines at the November 2004 Statewide General Elections", Secretary Shelley stated, in part:

> **"3. Parallel Monitoring** Following the procedures implemented at the March election, we will conduct parallel monitoring of voting systems at the November election. The monitoring will not involve taking any units out of service on Election Day. We will work with you to ensure that the monitoring does not interfere with the conduct of the election. Any costs will be borne by the Secretary of State's Office." (See Appendix C – Clarification of Conditions for using Electronic Voting Machines at the November 2004 Statewide General Elections*).*

II. Parallel Monitoring Program Overview

A. Program Purpose

Current federal, state, and county accuracy testing of DRE voting systems occurs prior to elections, and does not mirror actual voting conditions. This creates the potential that malicious code could be present that would be resistant to these test processes yet affect the accuracy of a system in any given election day. Examples of this type of tampering might include DRE units originally programmed to activate malicious code on a specific date (e.g. November 2, 2004) or code inserted into a particular DRE unit on Election Day to affect the outcome of a specific contest.

The Parallel Monitoring Program was developed as a supplement to current logic and accuracy testing processes. The goal was to determine the presence of malicious code by testing the accuracy of the machines to record, tabulate, and report votes using a sample of DRE equipment in selected counties under simulated voting conditions on Election Day. An underlying assumption of the Program is that all DRE units from a particular vendor are programmed with the same code and, therefore, if malicious code were present on one DRE unit, it would be present on all of the DRE units in a given voting system. As such, only a small sample is required to be tested on Election Day.

The Parallel Monitoring Program provides a "snapshot" of a specific Election Day. Thus, the value of the Program is limited to the November 2, 2004 Election Day and would need to be repeated in future elections in order to provide this extra level of verification of DRE equipment operation.

Parallel testing under actual voting conditions is intended to provide an additional level of verification that systemic malicious code is not present in the DRE voting systems. However, notwithstanding this additional level of testing, there are forms of malicious code that could affect the accuracy of a voting system that would not be detected by federal, state, local or parallel testing. Other detection methods, such as the Accessible Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail (AVVPAT), are necessary to expose these types of election tampering.

B. Program Scope

Eleven counties agreed to the conditions set forth in the Secretary's Directive and utilized DRE equipment for the November 2, 2004 election. Of these, one county—Los Angeles—was excluded from the Program because it only used DRE equipment for early voting and not in the

precincts on Election Day. Two DRE units plus all necessary peripheral equipment were tested in each of the participating counties by a combination of independent consultants and Secretary of State staff. The participating counties were:

- ? Alameda
- ? Merced
- ? Napa
- ? Orange
- ? Plumas
- ? Riverside
- ? San Bernardino
- ? Santa Clara
- ? Shasta
- ? Tehama

The ten participating counties provided a sampling of the four different DRE systems currently approved for use in California: Diebold AccuVote TS, ES&S iVotronic, Hart eSlate, and Sequoia AVC Edge.

C. Program Requisites

Security of the testing process in each of the selected counties was of paramount consideration. In order to be successful, the Program required certain requisites:

1. The counties agree to the conditions set forth in the Secretary's Directive, dated April 30, 2004.

2. The counties agree to host testing teams on November 2, 2004.

3. Selection of voting equipment in each of the counties be randomly determined, utilizing random number generator computer software to eliminate human error or bias.

4. Voting equipment be fully operational, prepared for the November 2, 2004 Election by the county and accessible for selection prior to November 2nd and for testing on November 2nd.

5. A secure storage area be available at each county to house the selected voting equipment prior to November 2, 2004.

6. Tamper evident, serially numbered security seals be placed on the selected voting machines.

7. A secure, appropriately equipped testing room be available at each county for the testing team on November 2, 2004.

8. A county representative be available to assist or provide guidance on logistical issues, while the team was in the county prior to and on November 2, 2004.

9. Testing, on November 2, 2004, be conducted by the testing teams without the involvement of voting system vendors.

D. Program Methodology

One precinct in each county was selected for testing. The precinct was selected using a random number generator software tool. Once the precinct was identified, the county provided the official sample ballots for that precinct. The official ballot, for the selected precinct, provided the foundation for the development of test scripts, for testing the DRE units in that county.

The counties were notified of the commencement of the Program by Secretary of State, Elections Analyst Michael Wagaman on September 17, 2004 (see Appendix D – Memo to Counties Regarding the Parallel Monitoring Program).

The table on the following page illustrates the counties, precincts and equipment designated to participate in the Program.

Test Counties, Precincts and Equipment

County	Consolidated Precinct	DRE Equipment	Card Activator
Alameda	42241-1	Diebold AccuVote TS	Spyrus
Merced	313-1	ES&S iVotronic	Communications Pack
Napa	221018-00	Sequoia AVC Edge	Card Activator
Orange	0047269-1	Hart eSlate	Judges Booth Control
Plumas	42241-1	Diebold Accuvote TS	Spyrus
Riverside	0044008-1	Sequoia AVC Edge	Card Activator
San Bernardino	161006-00	Sequoia AVC Edge	Card Activator
Santa Clara	0001873-1	Sequoia AVC Edge	Card Activator
Shasta	0000982-A	Sequoia AVC Edge	Card Activator
Tehama	50580-00	Sequoia AVC Edge	Card Activator

Table 1

1. Test Equipment Selection and Security

The DRE equipment to be tested in the counties was selected using one of two methodologies. For counties where the DRE equipment was pre-programmed and/or pre-assigned to a specific precinct, two units in the selected precinct were identified using a random number generator software tool. Where the DRE equipment was not pre-programmed and/or pre-assigned to a specific precinct, selection was accomplished by randomly selecting two numbers from the total number of DRE units in the county inventory using a random number generator software tool.

An exception to the above process occurred in Riverside County. At the request of the County, one of the DRE units tested was randomly

selected from those pre-assigned to the selected precinct, using the process described above. The second unit was selected using a random number generator software tool from the supply of units the county had programmed and prepared to be sent to the precincts, to replace units that became non-operational on Election Day.

Representatives from the Secretary of State's Office traveled to and met with representatives from each county for the purpose of identifying and securing selected DRE equipment. The Secretary of State representatives identified the equipment using the methodology outlined above and documented the selection on the Voting System Component Selection Form (see Appendix E – Voting System Component Selection). Secretary of State security seals were affixed to the equipment (see Appendix F – Equipment and Seals Index). The equipment was then segregated from the balance of the county inventory and secured and housed on the county premises until November 2, 2004. Encoders or voter card activators, voter access cards, supervisor cards, and other items necessary for testing, were also secured.

Table 2, on the following page, reflects the dates the equipment was secured in each county.

Testing Equipment Secured

County	Representative	Testing Equipment	Testing Accessories	Date Secured
Alameda	Steve Kawano	Diebold AccuVote TS, Spyrus	Voter Access Cards, Supervisor Card, DRE Keys, Encoder	10/14/2004
Merced	Steve Kawano	ES&S iVotronic, Communication Pack	None Required	10/26/2004
Napa	Steve Kawano	Sequoia Edge AVC, Card Activator	Voter Cards, Card Activator	10/22/2004
Orange	Michael Wagaman	Hart eSlate, JCB	None Required	10/21/2004
Plumas	Steve Kawano	Diebold AccuVote TS, Spyrus	Voter Access Cards, Supervisor Card, DRE Keys, Encoder	10/15/2004
Riverside	Michael Wagaman	Sequoia Edge AVC, Card Activator	Voter Cards, Card Activator	10/20/2004
San Bernardino	Michael Wagaman	Sequoia AVC Edge, Card Activator	Voter Cards, Card Activator	10/20/2004
Santa Clara	Steve Kawano	Sequoia Edge AVC, Card Activator	Voter Cards, Card Activator	10/22/2004
Shasta	Steve Kawano	Sequoia Edge AVC, Card Activator	Voter Cards, Card Activator	10/19/2004
Tehama	Steve Kawano	Sequoia Edge AVC, Card Activator	Voter Cards, Card Activator	10/25/2004

Table 2

2. Test Methodology

Procedures were created to provide a framework for: developing test scripts; defining the roles of the testers, observers and team leaders; documenting testing activity and discrepancy reporting; documenting equipment security, and; tracking test artifacts (see Appendix G – November 2004 General Election Parallel Monitoring Program Procedures).

Test scripts served as the tool to achieve the main goal of validating the accuracy of the DRE equipment. The required accuracy of the equipment is defined in the Secretary of State's Task Force Report, as "precision in recording, calculations and outputs".

Test scripts were designed to mimic the actual voter experience. Each script represented the attributes of a voter (party affiliation, language choice) and specified a candidate for which the tester should select in a specific contest. The test script form was laid out to record requisite details of the voting process for a "test voter" and served as a means to tally test votes and assist in verifying if all votes were properly recorded, compiled, and reported by the DRE unit.

For each county 101 test scripts were developed. While the test scripts were different for each county—depending on the demographics and the local contests—within a county, both DRE teams executed the same 101 test scripts.

3. Database Development

All contests, contest participants, voter demographics, script layouts and contents, and monitoring results were entered into a MS Access™ database. The database was a tool to manage 242 contests, over 1,000 contest participants and approximately 52,000 test voter selections from over 1,000 test scripts.

The database also served as a tool to verify the accuracy and completeness of the test scripts. Reports were generated from data contained in the database to verify such things as:

- Coverage of all contests and contest participants
- Demographic profile of each precinct
- Voting patterns
- Contest drop-off rates

- ? Test "voter" selection corrections
- ? Language choice
- ? Write-In Candidates

4. Test Script Characteristics

Test scripts contained various numbers of contests per county including the following general election contests:

- ? Statewide: President and Vice President, United States Senate, Propositions 1A, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, and 73
- ? Legislative: United States Representative, State Senate, State Assembly
- ? Local: Judicial, School, Transportation, County, City, and Local Measures

Coverage

Each set of scripts for a DRE contained the following coverage (see Appendix H – Test Script Characteristics by County).

- ? Every contest available in the precinct was included on the script in at least 84% of the total number of scripts executed on each DRE
- ? Some contests, but not all contests, available in the precinct were included on the script in 15% of the total number of scripts
- ? No contest selections available in the precinct were included on the script in one ballot script for each county (Blank ballot)
- ? 100% of all contests received at least one test vote on the script in order to verify it was being tallied correctly
- ? Attempt to use a voter access card more than once without reactivating the card

Demographic Profile and Voter Patterns

Test scripts were developed to mirror the actual distribution of voter demographics in a selected precinct and to ensure that the test scenarios matched actual ballot options for the General Election.

Test script selections were limited to the contests and contest candidates appropriate to the test voter's ballot type. A specific number of ballots were allocated to each party based on voter registration data for the selected precinct (see Appendix I – Party Affiliation in the Selected Precincts). Of the total number of ballots allocated to a party (e.g. Democrat, Republican) the following arbitrary voter patterns were applied:

- 60% of the ballots would "vote" straight party for partisan contests
- 25% of the ballots would "vote" straight party except for 1 to 3 contests for partisan contests which would provide for selections other than of that party
- 15% of the ballots would "vote" randomly for any party candidate for partisan contests

Contest Drop-Off Rates

A study was conducted based on drop-off rates from previous California Statewide elections. Based on that study, each set of scripts for a DRE contained the following contest drop-off rates (see Appendix J – Contest Drop-Off Rates).

- 1% of the scripts will not have a vote for the Presidential contest
- 5% of the scripts will not have a vote for the US Senate contest
- 0-16% of the scripts will not have votes for all the Propositions (for an average 8% drop-off)
- 7% of the scripts will not have a vote for the US Representative contest
- 9% of the scripts will not have a vote for the State Senate contest
- 10% of the scripts will not have a vote for the Assembly District contest

Test Voter Selection Correction

Each set of scripts for a DRE contained one each of the following common voter correction scenarios:

- Change a candidate selection on the same screen
- Change a candidate selection after advancing one screen
- Change a candidate selection after viewing the final summary/confirmation screen

Language Choice

Each set of scripts for a DRE provided for language choices as follows (see Appendix K – Language Choice by County):

- Alameda – English, Spanish, Chinese
- Merced – English, Spanish
- Napa – English
- Orange – Tagalog, Chinese, Spanish, English, Korean, Vietnamese
- Plumas – English
- Riverside – Spanish, English
- San Bernardino – Spanish, English
- Santa Clara – Tagalog, Chinese, Spanish, English, Vietnamese
- Shasta – English
- Tehama – English

Write-In Candidates

Each set of scripts for a DRE contained four (4) write-in candidates.

5. Test Script Components

Each test script consisted of the following components (see Appendix L – Sample Test Script):

Section 1:

County – name of the county where the test was conducted. County name was preprinted on the form.

System vendor – the name of the vendor was preprinted on the form.

Precinct – the precinct number used to develop the test scripts. The precinct number was pre-printed on the form.

Tester – the name of the tester. The tester completed the tester name when the test script was initiated.

Observer – the name of the observer. The tester completed the observer name when the test script was initiated.

Video Operator – the name of the video operator. Video operator name was completed by the tester when the test script was initiated.

Time Block – the period of time in which the script was scheduled to be completed. Time block was pre-printed on the script.

Actual Start time – the actual time the script was initiated. Start time was filled in by the tester when the script was initiated.

Section 2:

Voting Language – the language to be activated for the test script (See Appendix M – Test Script Options – List B). The voting language was pre-printed on the script.

Section 3:

This section outlined the steps required to complete the test script:

Step 1 – instructed the tester to display the test script number so it was clearly visible to the video camera. This would facilitate the process of verifying anomalies through the review of the videotape.

Step 2 – instructed the tester to activate a voter access card or code.

Step 3 – instructed the tester to insert the voter access card into the DRE unit or, in the case of Orange County, to enter the access code.

Step 4 – instructed the tester to vote for a candidate in each specified contest (see Appendix M – Test Script Options - List D for Statewide Contests and List E for Legislative and Local Contests). When the tester made the selection on the screen, they would manually check the "select" box on the test script. Any deviation from the script would require a discrepancy report to be completed. The discrepancy report number was then recorded in the defect column.

Common voter errors (see Appendix M – Test Script Options – List F) are randomly placed within a script's sequence of contest selections.

Step 5 – instructed the tester to stop on the confirmation/review screen to allow for the observer to verify the tester's selections.

Step 6 – instructed the observer to review the selections against the script and:

- If the selection is correct, initial in the verify box
- If the selection is incorrect, the observer documents the defect by initialing in the "defect" column, informs the tester of the needed correction and completes a discrepancy report documenting the actions
- The tester then will correct the selection and again stop at the confirmation/review screen
- The observer again reviews the selections against the script

Step 7 – Once all selections are confirmed as correct, the tester is instructed to cast the ballot.

6. Test Team Composition and Training

Testing teams were comprised of 62 individuals including eighteen Secretary of State employees, twenty-three consultant testers and twenty-one video operators (see Appendix N – Team Member Index).

In seven of the ten counties, testing teams were comprised of a Secretary of State employee tester, a consultant tester and a video

operator assigned to each of the two DRE to be tested. Due to the unique configuration of the Hart eSlate DRE system in Orange County, an additional testing team member was required. In Alameda and San Bernardino counties, a consultant was substituted for one Secretary of State employee.

With the exception of the video operators, each team member received 4.5 hours of Parallel Monitoring Program training. The training consisted of an overview of Secretary Shelley's directive regarding Parallel Monitoring Program, the objectives of the Program, an overview of the testing methodology and the required documentation, the roles and responsibilities of the testers and team leaders, a demonstration of each of the voting systems by the system vendors, security protocols and logistical information (see Appendix O – Training Agenda). In addition, team leaders received 2.5 hours of training specifically focused on pre-test and post-test equipment security, documenting testing activities, test artifact retention, additional security protocols, scheduled contact with the Project Manager, and protocols for interacting with county officials, employees and other observers.

In the event that a scheduled team member was unable to participate in the test activity on November 2nd, three alternate consultants and two alternate Secretary of State employees were requested to attend the training session.

7. Team Member Roles and Responsibilities

Team members rotated between the roles of tester and observer.

The responsibility of the tester was to:

1. Read the test script carefully.
2. Record the information in Section 1 of the test script – Tester, Observer, Video Operator(s), Actual Start Time.
3. Activate the voter access card in accordance with the test script (check for language choice).
4. Make voting selections on the screen in accordance with the test script.
5. Verify each vote selection by checking the “verify” box on the script after EACH selection is made.
6. Stop at the confirmation/review screen.

7. Wait while the Observer checks the vote selections for consistency with the test script.

    a. If the observer indicates a vote is inconsistent with the test script the observer will request the tester make the appropriate correction.

    b. Once the Observer indicates that all the selections are consistent with the test script, the observer will request the tester to proceed.

8. Cast the ballot.

The responsibility of the observer was to:

1. Read the test script carefully.

2. Verify that the voter access card is activated in accordance with the test script (verify language choice).

3. Verify that the vote selections made by the Tester are consistent with the test script.

    a. If vote selections are consistent with the test script, place a check in the "verify" box on the script for each vote and verbally indicate to the tester that he/she may proceed.

    b. If vote selections are not consistent with the test script, document each vote selection that is incorrect by initialing the "defect" column on the script and requesting the tester return to the appropriate screen and correct the vote selection.

4. Complete a discrepancy report and request the team leader review and sign off on the report.

5. Request the Tester move forward to the confirmation/review screen.

6. Review as noted above, verify that all vote selections made by the Tester are consistent with the test script and then verbally indicate to the Tester that he/she may proceed.

7. Observe the tester cast the ballot.

In addition to the above, one of the consultant testers in each county was designated as the team leader with responsibility for oversight of all aspects of the testing process and for acting as liaison with the county officials.

The responsibility of the team leader was to:

1. Ensure that the voting system equipment is secure at all times and that at no times will there be fewer than three team members in the room with the equipment.

2. Ensure that Equipment Security and Chain of Custody forms are completed accurately and in a timely manner.

3. Ensure all pre- and post-test activities are completed according to the Activity Checklist.

4. Ensure the test scripts are executed correctly and consistent with the time schedule.

5. Ensure discrepancy reports and logs are completed correctly and in a timely manner.

6. Ensure that all testing artifacts are collected, sealed, secured and returned to the Secretary of State.

7. Act as a liaison for contact with the county election personnel.

8. Initiate scheduled communications with the Secretary of State contacts.

9. Recognize and elevate issues, as appropriate.

Two video operators were at each county site. The video operators were given instructions to ensure the cameras captured all relevant activity (see Appendix P - Video Operator Responsibilities and Instructions).

The responsibility of the video operator was to:

1. Record the pre-test activities including documenting the condition of the security labels, equipment set-up, printing of "zero tally report", and opening the polls.

2. Record execution of the test scripts.

3. Ensure that the video was clearly focused on the DRE units through the entire testing process, including breaks.

4. Ensure that the summary page was captured for each vote cast.

5. Record the post-test activities including closing the polls, printing "tally report", removal of memory card, and application of security labels.

E. Schedule of Activity for November 2, 2004

Test teams were scheduled to arrive at their assigned county at varied times on the morning of November 2, 2004, to meet with county representatives, retrieve the voting equipment from storage, and be escorted to the testing room.

The test teams were given a checklist to ensure all required activity was accomplished in a timely manner (see Appendix Q – Testing Activity Checklist).

1. Pre-Test Set Up

From 6 a.m. to 7 a.m. each team was scheduled to:

- Coordinate with the video operator and ensure all relevant activity is recorded
- Examine and document the condition of the tamper evident seals applied to the equipment using the Equipment Security and Chain of Custody form (see Appendix R - Equipment Security and Chain of Custody Instructions and Forms)
- Set up the DRE units and card activator equipment
- Organize all equipment and supplies necessary to conduct the testing in a manner that would allow for executing the test scripts and provide a full view for the video camera
- Generate the "zero tally" report for each DRE

2. Executing the Test Scripts

Test teams were directed to follow a specific test execution schedule. The test schedule was developed based on voting trends. Therefore, more tests scripts were to be executed during peak times. The first peak of the day was between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m., the second peak was between 11:45 a.m. and 1:30 p.m., and the last peak was between 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m.

The teams were informed that there might be observers to the testing activities (see Appendix S – Observer Guidelines).

The team leaders were instructed to contact the Project Manager at Secretary of State headquarters at prescribed times: opening of the polls and initiation of testing, mid morning, lunch break, mid afternoon, dinner break, at the end of testing, and anytime a discrepancy disrupted the normal testing schedule (see Appendix T - November 2, 2004 Events Log).

The test schedule identifies set break times and set times of executing test scripts. Start and end times were printed on test scripts in order to facilitate adherence to the test schedule. The test schedule provided for 9.25 hours of testing.

Test Schedule

Activity	Start	End	# Tests
Set Up	6:00 a	7:00 a	
Vote	**7:00 a**	**9:00 a**	**21**
Break	9:00 a	9:30 a	
Vote	**9:30 a**	**10:15 a**	**6**
Break	10:15 a	10:30 a	
Vote	**10:30 a**	**11:15 a**	**7**
Lunch	11:15 a	11:45 a	
Vote	**11:45 a**	**1:30 p**	**18**
Break	1:30 p	1:45 p	
Vote	**1:45 p**	**2:30 p**	**8**
Break	2:30 p	2:45 p	
Vote	**2:45 p**	**3:30 p**	**6**
Break	3:30 p	3:45 p	
Vote	**3:45 p**	**4:30 p**	**7**
Dinner	4:30 p	5:00 p	
Vote	**5:00 p**	**6:30 p**	**12**
Break	6:30 p	6:45 p	
Vote	**6:45 p**	**8:00 p**	**16**
Close	8:00 p	9:00 p	
		Total:	**101**

Table 3

3. Documenting Discrepancies

During the course of the testing, the teams completed a discrepancy report for each deviation from the test script and/or test process and for any issues related to equipment malfunction. Each discrepancy report was reviewed and signed by the team leader and logged on the discrepancy log form. Discrepancy reports were preprinted and numbered sequentially. Discrepancy reports and logs were returned to the Secretary of State along with all other testing artifacts when testing was completed (see Appendix U – Discrepancy Reporting).

4. Post Test Activities

Between 8 p.m. and 9 p.m. the teams were scheduled to:

- Run the closing tally tape for their DRE equipment
- Secure the DRE equipment and apply security seals
- Document the security seal numbers
- Collect, inventory and verify labels on all video tapes (see Appendix V – Video Tape Index)
- Complete the Test Artifacts Inventory Checklist form ensuring all required items were collected and sealed for return to the Secretary of State's Office (see Appendix W - Test Artifacts Inventory Checklist)
- Return the equipment to a secure location

An exception to the above process occurred in Riverside County. The County does not have printers attached to the DRE units and therefore the tapes were generated from the memory cards at the Secretary of State's Office in Sacramento on November 4, 2004.

The test teams did not reconcile the tally tapes and had no knowledge of the expected outcomes.

III. Reconciling the Test Results

Team leaders returned test artifacts to the Secretary of State's Office in Sacramento on November 3, 2004. Each team leader met with the Project Manager and provided a briefing on how the testing proceeded in their assigned county, reviewed the inventory of artifacts, discussed each discrepancy report in detail, and reviewed the required documentation to ensure all had been completed correctly and that the Project Manager

understood all situations that had prompted the completion of a discrepancy report.

Test artifacts included the hardcopy tally printouts from the DRE equipment recording the results of the "test voting" for the day. Some DRE equipment had a printout for each DRE, while other DRE equipment generated a consolidated printout for both DRE units.

The analysis of the data and the reconciliation of actual results to expected results included the following tasks.

A. The DRE printouts from each unit, or the consolidated tape, were compared to the expected baseline tally figures from the Access™ database to identify inconsistencies between the actual results and the expected baseline tally figures (see Appendix X – Baseline Expected Tally vs. Actual Tally).

B. Discrepancy reports were reviewed and analyzed to determine what, if any, impact the described discrepancy would have on the actual results (see Appendix Y – Overview of All Discrepancy Reports).

   For example, a test script instructs the tester to vote for a candidate two times, the tester votes only once, and documents the discrepancy. During the reconciliation process a review of the totals shows the actual total differs by one from the expected total. The analyst reviews the discrepancy report that documents the deviation from the test script. This triggers a review of the specific test script, which confirms that the test script called for the tester to vote for a candidate two times, in error. The cause of the discrepancy is a test script error.

C. Anomalies documented in discrepancy reports were verified by completing a review of the test scripts.

D. If a discrepancy was not resolved by a review of the test scripts, the videotapes of the testing were analyzed. If the source of the anomaly was identified through a review of the videotape, a discrepancy report was completed.

   For example, a test script instructs the tester to activate a voter access card and specifies the contests and candidates to select. The tester activates a voter card then votes the ballot as specified by the test script. During the reconciliation process a review of the totals shows the actual total is off by one from the expected total in two categories. The analyst reviews the discrepancy reports and notes that there are no discrepancy reports that explain this difference. This triggers a review and analysis of the videotapes. The video reveals the tester

voting "yes" for Proposition 60 on test script number that instructed the tester to vote "no" for Proposition 60. The videotape reveals the source of the error. The analyst completes a discrepancy report noting the test script number, the error and the impact on the expected results. The cause of the discrepancy is a tester error. A discrepancy report is completed describing the incident (see Appendix Z – Discrepancy Reports that Affected the Tally by County).

E. There were additional discrepancy forms completed in each of the counties that did not affect the actual results. These discrepancy forms usually related to testers making corrections to selections before casting the ballot, testers having to "tap" multiple times to make the selection record on the DRE unit or short testing delays due to changing tapes for the video recordings.

IV. Parallel Monitoring Program Findings

Results of the reconciliation analysis indicate that the DRE equipment tested on November 2, 2004 recorded the votes as cast with 100% accuracy.

In six counties—Alameda, Napa, San Bernardino, Shasta, Tehama, and Riverside—the results matched exactly for all contests and no further analysis was required to reconcile the results.

For the remaining four counties—Merced, Orange, Plumas and Santa Clara—variations remained which could not be explained by the discrepancy reports completed during the testing. In these cases, the video recordings were analyzed. In all cases the analysis revealed the source of the discrepancies to be tester error.

A. Analysis and Results by County

This section provides the details of the analysis and specific test results for each county. Each county analysis is divided into three sections. Section 1 describes any variations from the test methodology, section 2 describes the comparison of the expected and the actual results and section 3 describes the process undertaken to determine the source of the discrepancies.

1. Alameda County

a) Variations in Test Methodology:

(1.) Opening of Polls - Due to a delay securing access to the testing room, testing did not begin until 7:10 a.m.

(2.) Storage of Test Artifacts - After sealing the memory cards in bags and using seals provided by the Secretary of State's Office, the memory cards were locked in a secure location a by a representative of the County. In the morning a representative of the Secretary of State's Office verified the seals were intact. The artifacts were then returned to the Secretary of State's Office without leaving the custody of the representative.

b) Comparison of Expected and Actual Results:

After the comparison of the expected and actual results, a total of zero discrepancies were identified.

c) Reconciliation of Discrepancies:

No reconciliation was necessary.

2. Merced County

a) Variations in Test Methodology:

Opening of Polls - Due to a delay in securing access to the testing room, testing did not begin until 7:30 a.m.

b) Comparison of Expected and Actual Results:

After the initial comparison of the expected and actual results, a total of six discrepancies were identified.

c) Reconciliation of Discrepancies

None of the discrepancy reports completed on November 2, 2004 resolved the identified variations.

The following discrepancy reports were completed when a review of the test videotapes resulted in the identification of the source of the variations from the expected results:

(1.) Report #17 – Tester Error: The tester improperly cast a "no" vote instead of a "yes" vote on Proposition 68. This resolved two discrepancies.

(2.) Report #18 – Tester Error: The tester improperly cast a "yes" vote instead of a "no" vote on Proposition 67. This resolved two discrepancies.

(3.) Report #19 – Tester Error: The tester appeared to correctly "tap" the screen to select candidate "Bush" for President however, on the screen candidate "Peroutka" was highlighted and the ballot recorded for him. This resolved two discrepancies. The cause of the improper candidate being selected is under investigation by the Office of the Secretary of State.

Comparison of Discrepancies in Merced County

Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Reports			
		Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
President	George W. Bush	58	57	-1	19	57	57	0
President	Michael Anthony Peroutka	0	1	+1	19	1	1	0
Proposition	Prop 67 - - Vote NO	25	24	-1	18	24	24	0
Proposition	Prop 67 - - Vote YES	64	65	+1	18	65	65	0
Proposition	Prop 68 - - Vote NO	25	26	+1	17	26	26	0
Proposition	Prop 68 - - Vote YES	63	62	-1	17	62	62	0

Table 4

3. Napa County

a) Variations in Test Methodology:

Opening of Polls - The County did not permit the Team to enter the building until 6:45 a.m. and therefore testing did not begin until 7:39 a.m.

b) Comparison of Expected and Actual Results:

After the comparison of the expected and actual results, a total of zero discrepancies were identified.

c) Reconciliation of Discrepancies:

No reconciliation was necessary.

4. Orange County

a) Variations in Test Methodology:

(1.) Team Member Composiiton – Due to the unique configuration of the system an additional team member was assigned to operate and monitor the Judges Booth Control (JBC). An additional video camera was set up to record the JBC.

(2.) The selected precinct did not provide a ballot definition with the option of selecting Tagalog as a language choice. The script instructing the voter to select Tagalog as a language choice was voted in English.

b) Comparison of Expected and Actual Results:

After the initial comparison of the expected and actual results, a total of two discrepancies were identified.

c) Reconciliation of Discrepancies:

The following discrepancy reports were completed when a review of the test videotapes resulted in the identification of the source of the variations from the expected results:

(1.) Report #15 and 16 – Tester Error: The tester improperly selected Gary G. Miller for US House of Representatives when the script instructed a selection of Gary V. Miller for School Trustee. This resolved two discrepancies.

Comparison of Discrepancies in Orange County

Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Reports			
		Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
U.S. House	Gary G. Miller	61	62	+1	15	62	62	0
School - Trustee Area 3	Gary V. Miller	42	41	-1	16	41	41	0

Table 5

5. Plumas County

a) Variations in Test Methodology:

No variations in test methodology occurred.

b) Comparison of Expected and Actual Results:

After the initial comparison of the expected and actual results, a total of twenty-three discrepancies were identified.

c) Reconciliation of Discrepancies:

The following discrepancy report was completed during the testing and adequately identified the source of twenty-one variations:

(1.) Report #2 – Tester Error: One team of testers voted only for propositions and did not vote for any candidates on the first 19 scripts. This resolved twenty-one discrepancies.

The following discrepancy report was completed when a review of the test videotapes resulted in the identification of the source of the variations from the expected results:

(2.) Report #14 – Tester Error: The tester improperly cast a "yes" vote instead of a "no" vote on Proposition 60. This resolved two discrepancies.

Comparison of Discrepancies in Plumas County

Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Reports			
		Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
President	David Cobb	1	0	-1	2	0	0	0
President	George W. Bush	40	38	-2	2	38	38	0
President	John F. Kerry	44	37	-7	2	37	37	0
President	Leonard Peltier	1	0	-1	2	0	0	0
President	Michael Anthony Peroutka	6	0	-6	2	0	0	0
President	Michael Badnarik	6	3	-3	2	3	3	0
U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	42	37	-5	2	37	37	0
U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	43	40	-3	2	40	40	0
U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	5	0	-5	2	0	0	0
U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	3	0	-3	2	0	0	0
U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	1	0	-1	2	0	0	0
U.S. House	David I. Winters	46	39	-7	2	39	39	0
U.S. House	John T. Doolittle	40	38	-2	2	38	38	0
State Senate	Dave Cox	42	36	-6	2	36	36	0
State Senate	Kristine Lang McDonald	44	41	-3	2	41	41	0
State Senate	Roberto Leibman	3	0	-3	2	0	0	0
State Assembly	Rick Keene	39	37	-2	2	37	37	0
State Assembly	Robert A. Woods	47	40	-7	2	40	40	0
State Assembly	Robert Burk	3	0	-3	2	0	0	0
School	John Sheehan	71	62	-9	2	62	62	0
School	Luiz G. Gutierrez	28	17	-11	2	17	17	0
Proposition	Prop 60 -- Vote NO	54	53	-1	14	53	53	0
Proposition	Prop 60 -- Vote YES	44	45	+1	14	45	45	0

Table 6

6. Riverside County

a) Variations in Test Methodology:

(1.) Review screen for the Spanish language choice ballot did not allow for confirmation of proposition selections. The County has since determined that the cause of this variation was a human error, which occurred when the ballot definition was developed.

(2.) Equipment did not show contest totals on screen for video recording.

b) Comparison of Expected and Actual Results:

After the comparison of the expected and actual results, a total of zero discrepancies were identified.

c) Reconciliation of Discrepancies:

No reconciliation was necessary.

7. San Bernardino

a) Variations in Test Methodology:

Opening of Polls - Due to the video operators' late arrival, the testing began at 7:05 a.m.

b) Comparison of Expected and Actual Results:

After the comparison of the expected and actual results, a total of zero discrepancies were identified.

c) Reconciliation of Discrepancies:

No reconciliation was necessary.

8. Santa Clara County

a) Variations in Test Methodology:

No variations in test methodology occurred.

b) Comparison of Expected and Actual Results:

After the initial comparison of the expected and actual results, it was determined that the total ballots cast was off by one entire script.

c) Reconciliation of Discrepancies

The following discrepancy report was completed when a review of the test scripts and test videotapes resulted in the identification of the source of the variations from the expected results:

(1.) Report #48 – Tester Error: A review of the test scripts identified one test script (test script #80) that included none of the required notations (i.e., tester names, start time, selection and verification sign off). A review of the videotape shows the tester executing test 79 and then 81. Test script 80 was inadvertently skipped and this caused the discrepancies.

Comparison of Discrepancies in Santa Clara County

Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Reports			
		Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
President	John F. Kerry	61	60	-1	48	60	60	0
U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	52	51	-1	48	51	51	0
U.S. House	Zoe Lofgren	57	56	-1	48	56	56	0
State Senate	Elaine Alquist	51	50	-1	48	50	50	0
State Assembly	Joe Coto	54	53	-1	48	53	53	0
Judicial	Enrique Colin	34	33	-1	48	33	33	0
School	Cecil Lawson	14	13	-1	48	13	13	0
Proposition	Prop 1A -- Vote YES	38	37	-1	48	37	37	0
Proposition	Prop 59 -- Vote YES	45	44	-1	48	44	44	0
Proposition	Prop 60 -- Vote NO	68	67	-1	48	67	67	0
Proposition	Prop 60A -- Vote YES	66	65	-1	48	65	65	0
Proposition	Prop 61 -- Vote YES	60	59	-1	48	59	59	0
Proposition	Prop 62 -- Vote YES	66	65	-1	48	65	65	0

Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Reports			
		Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Proposition	Prop 63 -- Vote YES	30	29	-1	48	29	29	0
Proposition	Prop 64 -- Vote YES	40	39	-1	48	39	39	0
Proposition	Prop 65 -- Vote NO	66	65	-1	48	65	65	0
Proposition	Prop 66 -- Vote YES	66	65	-1	48	65	65	0
Proposition	Prop 67 -- Vote YES	59	58	-1	48	58	58	0
Proposition	Prop 68 -- Vote YES	63	62	-1	48	62	62	0
Proposition	Prop 69 -- Vote YES	25	24	-1	48	24	24	0
Proposition	Prop 70 -- Vote YES	81	80	-1	48	80	80	0
Proposition	Prop 71 -- Vote YES	25	24	1	48	24	24	0
Proposition	Prop 72 -- Vote YES	65	64	-1	48	64	64	0
Local Measure	Measure A - Vote NO	42	41	-1	48	41	41	0
Local Measure	Measure B - Vote NO	55	54	-1	48	54	54	0
Local Measure	Measure C - Vote NO	69	68	-1	48	68	68	0
Local Measure	Measure G - Vote NO	73	72	-1	48	72	72	0
Local Measure	Measure K - Vote NO	63	62	-1	48	62	62	0
Local Measure	Measure N - Vote NO	79	78	-1	48	78	78	0
Local Measure	Measure S - Vote NO	60	59	-1	48	59	59	0

Table 7

9. Shasta County

a) Variations in Test Methodology:

No variations in test methodology occurred.

b) Comparison of Expected and Actual Results:

After the comparison of the expected and actual results, a total of zero discrepancies were identified.

c) Reconciliation of Discrepancies:

No reconciliation was necessary.

10. Tehama County

a) Variations in Test Methodology:

No variations in test methodology occurred.

b) Comparison of Expected and Actual Results:

After the comparison of the expected and actual results, a total of zero discrepancies were identified.

c) Reconciliation of Discrepancies:

No reconciliation was necessary.

Appendices

Appendix A

Security Measures for Touch Screen (DRE) Voting Systems for the March Election

February 5, 2004

TO: All County Clerks/Registrars of Voters (04043)

FROM: _____
KEVIN SHELLEY
Secretary of State

SUBJECT: SECURITY MEASURES FOR TOUCH SCREEN (DRE) VOTING SYSTEMS FOR THE MARCH ELECTION

There has been substantial public concern expressed about the security of DRE voting systems. These concerns are underscored by a recent study released by the state of Maryland citing ongoing security concerns regarding DRE systems.

As election officials, we have a responsibility to take proactive steps to assure voters that their votes will be counted as cast. As you know, I recently directed that all DRE voting system in use in California must include an "Accessible Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail" (AVVPAT). This technology is not available for the March 2, 2004 election. In light of the recent studies, we must address the public's concern on this issue for this election. Accordingly, listed below are several security measures for DRE machines for the March 2, 2004 Primary election. These measures are being required pursuant to Government Code section 12172.5, Elections Code sections 13002, 15001 et seq., 19370, and the procedures adopted for use of voting equipment in California.

As an additional security precaution, with respect to the ongoing investigation of Diebold, I have directed that the source code for the TSx system be provided to my office prior to the March election.

I. PARALLEL MONITORING

One significant concern that has been raised is the possibility that unauthorized programmers could illegally manipulate the software that counts ballots on DRE equipment. My office will be implementing a program to randomly select voting machines to be set aside for experts to vote on March 2, 2004. These machines will be voted exactly as if they were in polling places, any anomalies will be detected, and appropriate remedies will be pursued. I will provide more details on the procedures for this program in the accompanying CCROV.

II. PROHIBIT THE USE OF NETWORK CONNECTIONS AND WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY

To ensure the integrity of the voting process, and to prevent "hackers" from gaining access to voting equipment, no voting equipment used at the March 2, 2004 election shall be permitted to be connected during voting hours to any exterior network and no connection to the Internet shall be permitted at any time. In addition, modem access to GEMS must be enabled only when uploads are expected. Finally, no voting equipment will be permitted to include the hardware necessary to permit wireless transmission, and no communication of votes or vote totals will be permitted to be transmitted using wireless technology.

III. POST RESULTS AT EACH POLLING PLACE

Some members of the public and the media have indicated concern that once the results of the vote leave the polling place citizens have no ability to check on whether the results from that polling place are accurately conveyed to the central counting facility. Therefore, a copy of the results from each voting unit that is capable of printing out a tabulation of the results shall be posted for public inspection for at least 24 hours outside each polling place.

IV. RECORD OF THE VOTE

As part of the official canvass for the March 2, 2004 election, a complete copy of the images of the voted ballots cast on each touch screen (DRE) voting machine used in the election shall be printed out on paper for each precinct that is subject to the one percent manual recount or other official recount or contest. The paper record shall be used for the one percent manual recount to audit the machine-tabulated total unless there is evidence that the paper record has been corrupted or is incomplete.

For official recounts other than the one percent manual recount or for contests, tinted and watermarked paper or paper overprinted with a design shall be used. The paper version of the images shall be utilized for purposes

of any such recount or contest unless there is evidence that the paper record has been corrupted or is incomplete.

In addition, as part of the semi-official canvass for the March 2, 2004 election, counties utilizing touch screen (DRE) voting systems shall produce at least four original CD-ROMs or DVD-ROMs containing images of the voted ballots cast on each touch screen (DRE) voting machine used in the election. Two of the CD-ROMs or DVD-ROMs shall immediately be filed with the Secretary of State. Two of the CD-ROMs or DVD-ROMs shall be retained by the county elections official.

V. ELECTION MONITORS

The issue of voter confidence in the voting systems is critical. In order to assure the public that someone is watching the process for the primary election on March 2, 2004, and that efforts to manipulate the voting process will be prevented or detected, my office will provide Election Monitors in each of the jurisdictions using DRE equipment in the March election. These Monitors will travel from polling place to polling place and report immediately any instances of equipment malfunction or attempts to tamper with voting equipment. Similarly, Monitors will be on-site for the counting of the ballots at the central counting facility. These Monitors shall be provided Secretary of State identification, and shall be granted unrestricted access to polling places.

VI. ADDITIONAL MEASURES

In addition to the important security measures outlined above, there are a number of procedural steps that must be taken for the March 2, 2004 election to provide public confidence in the voting process. These include:

A. Each county must prepare and submit to the Secretary of State by February 20, 2004, an “Election Security Plan” that addresses both the physical security of the voting equipment, software, and firmware and the internal security controls (e.g. software access controls, hardware access controls, password management, etc.) for the voting system. Each plan will be independently reviewed.

B. Similarly, each vendor of DRE equipment used in the March election must submit to the Secretary of State by February 17, 2004, an “Election Security Plan” that completely describes the technical and physical securities of voting and vote counting equipment, software, and firmware. Each plan will be independently reviewed.

C. Each county shall prepare and submit to the Secretary of State by February 17, 2004, an “Election Observer Panel Plan” (EOPP) that specifies the procedures for public participation in and observation of the election process, including the Logic And Accuracy testing for

voting equipment and vote counting equipment. The EOPP will also include publicizing the opportunity and procedure for public observation.

D. If the Logic and Accuracy testing is conducted using an automated vote script, the testing shall also include a randomized and statistically significant manual entry of votes as a check against the automated script. All test scripts, automated and manual shall be retained until the period for contesting the election has expired.

E. Each county shall provide a copy of their tabulation software for escrow with the Secretary of State by February 25, 2004. This software must be able to duplicate the county tabulation of election results.

F. Each county shall notify the Secretary of State by February 17, 2004, of the membership of the Logic and Accuracy Board and to send to the Secretary of State a copy of the certificate of that board attesting to the results of pre-election testing of the voting and vote counting equipment. The county shall permit and encourage public participation, as appropriate, on the Logic and Accuracy Board.

G. As specified in the procedures adopted for use of voting equipment in California, and to prevent undetected tampering, serialized or other secure tamper-proof devices/seals must be placed on all ports where memory cards are inserted. Poll workers must log any instance of suspected tampering and no machine shall be used if tampering is evident. An audit log of any action or operation on any voting equipment or software shall be maintained and retained until the period for contesting the election has expired.

H. For those DRE systems that use a "voter card" or "smart card" to activate voting, the card shall not be issued to a voter until a voting station is available. If lines are to form, ensure that they form at the registration table and not at the voting stations.

I. County "troubleshooters", "rovers" or other election deputies circulating to polling places on election day should survey each polling site for any evidence of tampering or attempted intrusion into the voting equipment and immediately report to Secretary of State Monitor.

J. For those counties using DRE equipment, during transportation of election materials to the central count or remote count locations, all election media must be in the possession of at least two election officials/poll workers.

K. The election official shall ensure the protection of the election tabulation process by securing the premises where the vote tabulation is being conducted and not allowing unauthorized and unescorted personnel to be in contact with tabulation equipment.

L. After tabulation, printed results tapes and a backup copy of the tabulation shall be placed in locked storage in a secure location, and shall remain there until the expiration of the period for challenging elections and for as long as required by law, unless a court orders their release.

M. On Election night during tabulation, or following tabulation, all of the event logs, ballot images and summary totals from each cartridge used in the election shall be backed up to the tabulation database.

B&e/security15-024

Appendix B

State of California

SECRETARY OF STATE

DECERTIFICATION AND WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL OF CERTAIN DRE VOTING SYSTEMS AND CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE USE OF CERTAIN DRE VOTING SYSTEMS

I. Recitals

Whereas, pursuant to Elections Code section 19201, no voting system, in whole or in part, may be used unless it has received the approval of the Secretary of State;

Whereas, existing law requires that I, as Secretary of State for the State of California, conduct periodic reviews of voting systems to determine if they are defective, obsolete, or otherwise unacceptable for use;

Whereas, pursuant to my statutory obligations, I have undertaken such a review of voting systems approved for use in California, to determine if they are defective, obsolete, or otherwise unacceptable for use in the November 2004 General Election in California;

Whereas, on April 21, 2004, April 22, 2004, and April 28, 2004, a duly noticed public hearing was held to give interested persons an opportunity to express their views regarding the use of various voting systems in the November 2004 General Election in California. At these hearings approximately 100 individuals testified. Many more submitted comments by letter, fax and electronic mail;

Whereas, following the duly noticed public hearing on April 21, 2004, April 22, 2004, and April 28, 2004, the Voting Systems and Procedures Panel recommended that I withdraw approval of the use of certain voting systems to be used at the November 2004 General Election unless certain conditions for their use were implemented;

Whereas, pursuant to Elections Code section 19222, I, as Secretary of State am authorized to withdraw approval previously granted of any voting system or part of a voting system should I determine that voting system or any part of that voting system be defective or otherwise unacceptable;

Whereas, I have reviewed voting systems approved for use in California and I have reviewed and considered several reports regarding the use of voting systems, including Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting systems and other voting systems, the public testimony presented at the hearings referenced above, numerous communications from elections officials, State Legislators, members of the disabled community, voting rights advocates, vendors of voting systems and interested members of the public, and other materials, as well as the findings and recommendations of the Voting Systems and Procedures Panel;

Whereas, pursuant to Elections Code section 19222, six months' notice must be given before withdrawing approval previously granted of any voting system or part of a voting system unless I, as Secretary of State, for good cause shown, make a determination that a shorter period is necessary;

Whereas, pursuant to Elections Code section 19222, any withdrawal of approval by the Secretary of State of previous approval of a voting system or part of a voting system is not effective as to any election conducted within six months of that withdrawal;

II. *Therefore*, I, Kevin Shelley, Secretary of State for the State of California, find, determine and order, pursuant to Division 19 of the Elections Code and Government Code section 12172.5, as follows:

A. Findings and Determinations

1. DRE voting systems currently approved for use in California pursuant to Division 19, Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 19001) of the Elections Code and Government Code section 12172.5:

    a. Do not produce an accessible voter verified paper audit trail permitting a voter to independently and contemporaneously verify the accuracy of the electronic vote recording so as to ensure that his or her vote is counted in accordance with Section 2.5 of Article II of the *California Constitution*;

2

b. Do not permit meaningful recounts specified in Elections Code sections 15360, 15610, 15620, 15621, 15623, 15627 and 15640;

c. May not permit a contest to be decided by a meaningful recount of the votes, as provided for in Division 16 (commencing with section 16000) of the Elections Code;

d. Use proprietary source codes that are complex and secret so that the absence of malicious code in the firmware is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to prove or determine;

e. Involve sophisticated electronic technology that cannot easily be operated and, when necessary, repaired by many poll workers, which sometimes results in voters not voting the correct ballot type and which is sometimes vulnerable to unexpected functional failure resulting in the disenfranchisement of voters;

f. May be the subject of erroneous programming or other human errors that may not be detected prior to the commencement of voting;

g. May be subject to tampering and/or manipulation if insufficient security enhancements are not in place or are not properly implemented;

B. Orders

***Therefore*, I, Kevin Shelley, Secretary of State for the State of California, hereby direct, pursuant to Division 19, Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 19001) of the Elections Code and Government Code section 12172.5, that:**

1. For the reasons set forth above, DRE voting systems, including but not limited to the Diebold AccuVote-TS, the ES&S iVotronic, the Sequoia AVC Edge, and the Hart eSlate, and any other DRE voting system, previously approved, are found and are determined to be defective or unacceptable and approval for their use in subsequent elections in California is immediately decertified and withdrawn, except as specifically provided below.

2. DRE voting systems are approved for use in California only if (a) Paragraph 3 **or** 4 below applies **and** (b) Paragraph 5 below applies.

3. No new DRE voting system may be used in California unless it includes a fully tested, federally qualified and state certified accessible, voter verified, paper audit trail, and there is compliance with all of the conditions set forth in Paragraph 5 below. For purposes of this paragraph, any modified version of the Diebold AccuVote-TSx voting system submitted to the Secretary of State for certification shall be deemed to be a new DRE voting system.

4. DRE voting systems used in the March 2, 2004 Statewide Primary Election, but not including the AccuVote-TSx voting system, are approved for use in the jurisdictions in which they were previously used if there is compliance with all of the conditions set forth in Paragraph 5 below. In addition, such voting systems, as a condition of approval of their use in subsequent elections, must comply with the following conditions:

   a. The voting system must include a fully tested, federally qualified and state certified accessible, voter verified paper, audit trail; **or**

   b. There must be compliance with the following conditions:

      (1) Permit every voter to have the option at his or her polling place of casting a ballot on a paper ballot which may be satisfied by providing an adequate number of paper ballots to each polling place based on each County's assessment of the number of persons who may request them. The cost of additional paper ballots specified in this paragraph shall be borne by the vendor of the voting system that sought its certification or approval for use in California, or the vendor's successor in interest;

      (2) At the time the ballot is cast or during the period allowed for conducting the official canvass, a paper version or representation of each ballot cast on each unit of the voting system shall be printed out on paper. The paper version shall not be provided to the voter but shall be retained by elections officials for use during the one percent manual recount or other recount or contest. The cost of printing a paper version or representation of each ballot cast on each unit and the storage

4

of such printouts specified in this paragraph shall be borne by the vendor of the voting system that sought its certification or approval for use in California, or the vendor's successor in interest;

(3) The voting system shall be subject to "parallel monitoring" as directed by the Secretary of State;

(4) At least 46 days prior to any election in which the voting system is proposed to be used, the elections official conducting the election shall submit a Technical Security Plan that is consistent with the directives of the Secretary of State and the recommendations contained in the *Trusted Agent Report to the Maryland Department of Legislative Services by RABA Innovative Solution Cell (RiSC)* dated January 20, 2004 (RABA Report) (http://www.raba.com/press.html?id=9) to the extent that the recommendations are applicable to the voting system proposed for use;

5. All DRE voting systems used in California, including those that include an accessible, voter verified paper audit trail, as defined by the Secretary of State, must meet the following conditions:

a. Certification and Testing

(1) Federal Testing and Qualification The voting system, and all of its hardware, software, and firmware, including all of its peripheral equipment, has been fully tested by and qualified for use by the appropriate federal entities, if applicable;

(2) State Testing and Certification The voting system, and all of its hardware, software, and firmware, including all of its peripheral equipment, has been approved for use in California elections by the Secretary of State of the State of California following full testing;

(3) Documentation

(a) The Source Code for any software and firmware used as part of any of the voting system, including commercial off the shelf software that is available to and disclosable

5

by the vendor, shall, upon demand of the Secretary of State, at any time before or after approval is requested, be provided to the designee or designees of the Secretary of State for analysis, subject to any reasonable time and confidentiality restrictions, as determined by the Secretary of State;

(b) The full record of all documents submitted or resulting from the federal qualification process shall, upon demand of the Secretary of State, at any time before or after approval is requested, be provided to the designee or designees of the Secretary of State for analysis, subject to any reasonable time and confidentiality restrictions, as determined by the Secretary of State;

(c) Complete documentation of each hardware, software and firmware version for any component of the voting system, including detailed change logs, for any part of the voting system, shall, upon demand of the Secretary of State, at any time before or after approval is requested, be provided to the designee or designees of the Secretary of State for analysis, subject to any reasonable time and confidentiality restrictions, as determined in the sole discretion of the Secretary of State;

(d) Complete documentation regarding the development environment and development process for any software or firmware used in any component of the voting system, including but not limited to configuration files, translators, libraries, and options sufficient to allow exact reconstruction of the object code used in any component of the voting system, shall, upon demand of the Secretary of State, at any time before or after approval is requested, be provided to the designee or designees of the Secretary of State for analysis, subject to any reasonable time and confidentiality restrictions, as determined by the Secretary of State;

(4) Functional Systems Provided to Secretary of State Upon demand of the Secretary of State, at any time before or after approval is requested, the vendor seeking approval or whose

6

voting system has been approved, shall provide to the Secretary of State, a working version of the components, including all hardware, software and firmware, of the voting system that is proposed to be used at an election, for purposes of analysis and testing, staff reference and public education. The components shall be maintained in working order by the vendor;

(5) Limits on Requests for Late Modifications A request for a change or modification of the voting system that might impair the accuracy and efficiency of the voting system shall not be submitted to the Secretary of State, unless specifically authorized by the Secretary of State, within 46 days prior to any election in which the voting system is proposed to be used.

b. Security

(1) Telephone Connections No component of the voting system shall be permitted to receive official elections results through an exterior communication network, including the public telephone system;

(2) No Wireless Connection Hardware No component of the voting system shall include the hardware necessary to permit wireless communications or wireless data transfers to be transmitted or received;

(3) No Internet Connections No component of the voting system shall be physically connected at any time, directly or indirectly, to the Internet;

(4) Physical Security Plans At least 90 days prior to any election in which the voting system is proposed to be used, the elections official conducting the election shall submit to the Secretary of State, a Physical Security Plan regarding all of the components of the voting system, including the details of how a chain of custody with respect to all of the components is monitored and documented;

(5) Compliance with Directives The elections officials conducting an election using the voting system, and the vendor of the voting system that has sought its certification or approval for use in Califor-

7

nia, or the vendor's successor in interest, shall abide by any directive issued by the Secretary of State of California, in writing, that is designed to safeguard or enhance the security of the voting system and its use, including, but not limited to, directives related to random audits, poll monitoring, parallel monitoring, security plans, election observer plans, Logic and Accuracy Tests, the providing of tabulation software for escrow with the Secretary of State, and physical security plans. Any such directive will be issued within a reasonable timeframe before the election to allow for full compliance;

c. Poll Workers

(1) Training The elections official conducting the election shall, at least 46 days prior to the election in which the voting system is proposed to be used, submit to the Secretary of State the Poll Worker Training Plan for the election in every jurisdiction using that system, including a copy of the materials to be provided to the poll workers. The training must provide adequate, hands-on training for each poll worker for the voting system being used, including instruction on the use of each component part and the steps to follow if any component of the voting system fails or appears to fail to function properly;

(2) Communication Plan The elections official conducting the election shall, at least 46 days prior to the election in which the voting system is proposed to be used, submit to the Secretary of State a Communications Plan detailing how elections officials and polls workers at each polling place will communicate on Election Day.

d. Polling Places

(1) Provisional Ballots Provisional voters must cast ballots on paper ballots;

(2) Disability Access Devices Disability Access Devices, intended to benefit voters who desire to use such devices, shall be connected to voting machines prior to the time the polls open;

(3) Posting of Results A copy of the results from each voting unit that is capable of printing out a tabulation of the results shall be

8

posted for public inspection for at least 48 hours outside each polling place;

(4) Tampering Penalties Posted There shall be posted at polling places, in all applicable languages, a notice regarding the penalties for tampering with any component of the voting system;

III. *Therefore*, I, Kevin Shelley, Secretary of State of California, further find and determine, pursuant to Elections Code section 19222, that based on the materials, testimony and comments I have reviewed and considered, and the findings and recommendation of the Voting Systems and Procedures Panel, there is good cause why notice of the withdrawal of approval of voting systems, as specified above, is necessary to be shorter than six months. I also find and determine that it is necessary that such notice be effective immediately in order to provide time for conducting subsequent elections in California fairly, efficiently and to ensure the integrity of the elections process.

It is so found, determined and ordered.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I execute this Certificate and affix the Great Seal of the State of California this 30th day of April, 2004.

KEVIN SHELLEY
Secretary of State

9

Appendix C

SECRETARY OF STATE
KEVIN SHELLEY
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE: May 14, 2004

TO: **Counties of Alameda, Los Angeles, Merced, Napa, Orange, Plumas, Riverside, San Bernardino, Santa Clara, Shasta, Tehama**

FROM: _____
KEVIN SHELLEY
SECRETARY OF STATE

SUBJECT: **CLARIFICATION OF CONDITIONS FOR USING ELECTRONIC VOTING MACHINES AT THE NOVEMBER 2004 STATEWIDE GENERAL ELECTION**

Many county elections officials have requested clarification of the 23 conditions for using DREs at the November election. Based on numerous conversations with elections officials, vendors and other interested parties, we are providing the following information. If you have additional questions, please do not hesitate to let us know.

1. **Provide Option of Voting on Paper at Polling Places -** Should there be an unexpected failure of a voting system or any of its components, we want to ensure that voters are not disenfranchised. Therefore, paper ballots must be available at all polling places as a backup. A voter must have the option of voting on paper if he or she wishes. Provisional ballots may be used for this purpose. The Secretary of State's Office is committed to ensuring that any cost of making paper ballots available is not borne by counties.

2. **Creating a Permanent Record of Each Ballot Cast -** We believe that creating a permanent record of each ballot cast is useful for purposes of subsequent auditing of the system even though the record created lacks the benefits of a voter verified paper audit trail. Therefore, as we directed at the March election, at least four original CD-Rs, DVD-Rs or DVD+Rs (**but not CD-RWs, DVD-RWs or DVD+RWs**) containing images of the voted ballots cast on each touch screen (DRE) voting machine used in the election must be

created. Two of the disks should immediately be sent to the Secretary of State. Two of the disks should be retained by the county elections official. The Secretary of State's Office is committed to ensuring that any cost of creating the disks is not borne by counties.

3. **Parallel Monitoring** - Following the procedures implemented at the March election, we will conduct parallel monitoring of voting systems at the November election. The monitoring will not involve taking any units out of service on Election Day. We will work with you to ensure that the monitoring does not interfere with the conduct of the election. Any costs will be borne by the Secretary of State's Office.

4. **Provide a Technical Security Plan** - We want to ensure that all reasonable steps are being taken to secure the voting system from tampering. Therefore, a Technical Security Plan must be submitted to the Secretary of State by September 17, 2004. The Plan should be consistent with the recommendations contained in the *RABA Report* (*Trusted Agent Report to the Maryland Department of Legislative Services by RABA Innovative Solution Cell (RiSC)* dated January 20, 2004 (http://www.raba.com/press.html?id=9)), to the extent applicable, to the voting system being used. At a minimum, the Plan must, to the extent applicable to the voting system being used, provide for creating security key cards with computer-generated passwords by precinct. By obtaining the plans, we anticipate being a resource for the counties by serving as a clearinghouse for "best practices" in this regard. However, in order to avoid compromising security, the details of the plans will be kept confidential by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State's Office is committed to ensuring that any additional cost of preparing the Technical Security Plan is not borne by counties.

5. **Federal Testing and Qualification** - Federal testing and qualification are essential to help ensure that all components of a voting system function accurately, reliably and securely. To the extent that federal testing and qualification apply, we believe that all components of a voting system must pass federal testing and qualification procedures. We are working with the vendors with respect to federal testing and qualification. This should not involve any county costs.

6. **State Testing and Certification -** Full state testing and certification is essential with respect to all components of a voting system to help ensure that the voting system functions accurately, reliably and securely. Therefore, these are requirements with respect to all components, including peripheral components such as precinct control modules or similar devices. We are working with vendors with respect to state testing and certification. This should not involve any county costs.

7. **Late Modifications -** We are concerned that in the past we were often presented with requests for approval of proposed last-minute changes in software, firmware or hardware. These requests often were made so close to the election that adequate federal or state testing could not be performed. Therefore, to allow time for adequate testing, proposed changes in software, firmware or hardware, with respect to the November election, must, except in the most extraordinary circumstances, be submitted by September 17, 2004. This should not involve any county costs.

8. **No Official Results Received by Component Modem -** Our security experts advise us that receiving official results through a public telephone system increases risks of tampering with electronic voting systems. Therefore, official results must not be received through a public telephone. This should not involve any county costs.

9. **No Wireless Connection -** Our security experts advise us that wireless telephone connections to voting system components increase risks of tampering with electronic voting systems. Therefore, wireless connections cannot be part of any voting system. This should not involve any county costs.

10. **No Internet Connection Modem -** Our security experts advise us that Internet connections increase risks of tampering with electronic voting systems. Therefore, Internet connections with any part of a voting system are not permitted, directly or indirectly, at any time. This should not involve any county costs.

11. **Physical Security Plan -** We want to ensure that all reasonable steps are being taken to secure the voting system from tampering. Therefore, a Physical Security Plan must be submitted to the Secretary of State by August 4, 2004. The Plan should be consistent with the recommendations contained in the *RABA Report* (*Trusted Agent Report to the Maryland Department of Legislative Services by RABA Innovative Solution Cell (RiSC)* dated January 20, 2004 (http://www.raba.com/press.html?id=9)), to the extent applicable. At a minimum, the Plan must, to the extent applicable to the voting system being used, provide for applying tamper resistant tape to terminals to prevent non-authorized entry of security key cards into the terminals and instituting strict procedures to prevent the use of unauthorized supervisor cards. By obtaining the plans, we anticipate being a resource for the counties by serving as a clearinghouse for "best practices" in this regard. However, in order to avoid compromising security, the details of the plans will be kept confidential by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State's Office is committed to ensuring that any additional cost of preparing the Physical Security Plan is not borne by counties.

12. **Compliance with Security Enhancements -** We want to ensure that all reasonable steps are being taken to secure the voting system from tampering and to ensure its accuracy, reliability, security and accessibility. Therefore, counties will be subject to poll monitoring such as that conducted at the March Statewide Primary Election and there must be compliance with all of the procedures set forth in the approved procedures for the particular voting system being used. In addition, as provided for in Elections Code section 15001, a copy of each election computer vote count program must be provided to the Secretary of State for escrow no later than 5 p.m. on the seventh day before the election.

13. **Poll Worker Training -** The success of the election depends, in large part, on poll worker training. Therefore, a Poll Worker Training Plan must be sent to the Secretary of State by September 17, 2004. By obtaining the plans, we anticipate being a resource for the counties by serving as a clearinghouse for "best practices" in this regard. The Secretary of State's Office is committed to ensuring that any additional cost of preparing the Poll Worker Training Plan is not borne by counties.

14. **Communication Plan s** One of the problems that was identified in some counties at the March election was difficulty in communicating between the polling places and the central elections offices. Therefore, a Communication Plan must be sent to the Secretary of State by September 17, 2004. By obtaining the plans, we anticipate being a resource for the counties by serving as a clearinghouse for "best practices" in this regard. The Secretary of State's Office is committed to ensuring that any additional cost of preparing the Communication Plan is not borne by counties.

15. **Provisional Ballots on Paper -** There were problems at the March election with respect to processing electronic provisional ballots under Elections Code section 14310(c)(3)(A). Therefore, provisional ballots, except at early voting sites, must be on paper. The Secretary of State's Office is committed to ensuring that any additional cost of making provisional paper ballots available is not borne by counties.

16. **Disability Access Devices -** At the March election, we received complaints from some individuals with disabilities that some disability access devices attached to DREs did not work properly resulting in possible disenfranchisement. We believe that it is appropriate to identify any problems with the disability access devices before the polls open so that the problems can be fixed before voting begins. Therefore, the devices must be tested before the polls open. This should not involve any county costs.

17. **Posting of Results** - We believe that the Elections Code requires that after the polls have closed, results should be posted at the polling place for each electronic voting machine if the machine is capable of printing out results. The results should be posted for 48 hours but elections officials are not required to monitor the polling place after the polls have closed to ensure that the posting remains for the entire period. It is sufficient to advise the facility owner or manager that the posting should remain for 48 hours. This should not involve any county costs.

18. **Tampering Penalties -** In order to deter any tampering of electronic voting machines and consistent with the *RABA Report* (*Trusted Agent Report to the Maryland Department of Legislative Services by RABA Innovative Solution Cell (RiSC)* dated January 20, 2004 (http://www.raba.com/press.html?id=9), the penalties for tampering with voting devices should be posted. We will provide signs that can be used for this posting. This should not involve any county costs.

Vendor Conditions:

Several conditions involve vendors rather than county elections officials. For example, vendors must provide to the Secretary of State source codes and functioning systems as well as specific documentation regarding voting systems. These conditions are being discussed directly with vendors.

Appendix D

SECRETARY OF STATE
KEVIN SHELLEY
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

If there are any additional issues that arise with respect to the manner of complying with the conditions outlined in the Directive of April 30, 2004, please bring them to our attention for review.

September 17, 2004

TO: All County Clerks/Registrars of Voters (04296)

FROM: _____
MICHAEL WAGAMAN
Elections Division

RE: Parallel Monitoring Program

The Secretary of State in conjunction with participating counties is beginning work to implement the Parallel Monitoring Program for DRE voting systems for the upcoming November 2nd General Election. The following is an overview of how the program will be conducted.

Ten counties have agreed to participate in this effort. The counties are Alameda, Merced, Napa, Orange, Plumas, Riverside, San Bernardino, Santa Clara, Shasta and Tehama.

For each county selected, the Secretary of State will randomly select two DRE unit(s) and one activator unit for use in the Parallel Monitoring Program. A representative from the Secretary of State will make the selection and secure the machines within the county's main office until Election Day. This selection and storage will occur on a timeline arranged between the Secretary of State and each county during the time after the county has completed programming and sealing against tampering according to normal procedures but before distribution to polling places. **We will not remove machines from polling places as part of the Parallel Monitoring Program.**

On Election Day, teams consisting of six individuals at least one of which will be an employee of the Secretary of State will arrive in each selected county to conduct the Parallel Monitoring Program using specially developed test scripts. **Security measures will be implemented to ensure that results from these machines will not be included in unofficial or official tabulation results.**

Additional details about the program are included in the accompanying proposed procedures.

In addition, we have scheduled a conference call on Thursday, September 23 from 12:00 to 2:00 to discuss the program. The call in number is 1-866-508-3383. The participant code is 298820. Further documentation will be provided to counties selected to participate in the program prior to the conference call.

If you have additional questions you can reach me by email at mwagaman@ss.ca.gov, by phone at (916) 653-5534 or by fax at (916) 653-3214.

Thank you for your continued time and consideration as we work together to ensure a fair and secure election.

Appendix E

November 2, 2004 Election Parallel Monitoring Program
Voting System Component Selection
Riverside County

SOS Representative: Michael Wagaman **Date:** October 20, 2004

County Representative: _____ **Vender System**: Sequoia

Confirm Precinct Number: 0044008-1 **Yes** **No** **Confirm ballot type "112" for this Precinct** **Yes** **No**

Number of assigned DRE units in selected precinct: _____
Location Equipment is secured until November 2, 2004: _____

Equipment Description and Firmware (e.g., DRE AccuVote TS 4.3.15.d, Spyrus Voter Card Encoder v.1.3.2, SOS PMP pouch)	**Manufacturers Serial Number (if applicable)**	**County Seal/Label** (if applicable)	**SOS Seal Number**	**Location of Seal** (e.g., front of unit, data port--if pouch, record contents of the pouch)
			010066	
			010067	
			010068	
			010069	
			010070	
			010071	
			010072	
			010073	
			010074	
			010075	
			010076	
			010077	
			010078	

The equipment above represents all the equipment required to operate the DRE voting system in a polling place (to set up the equipment, run a zero tape, activate and operate the DRE, run a tally tape of activity, etc). This equipment has been prepared consistent with the County Policies & Procedures and the State of California Election Code. The equipment is now and will remain in a secured environment with controlled access until moved to the agreed upon testing room on November 2, 2004.

County Representative:_____ Date:_____

Note: Secure all equipment needed to conduct the testing (to operate the DRE voting system in a polling place). This will include, but may not be limited to, two DRE units, and for each of the DRE units: a card activator (one activator may be used for both machines), a supervisor card, voter cards (several in case of failure we don't need to bother the ROV) and the DRE keys. Discuss this with the ROV to ensure all equipment is secured.

Seal all ports, the front of the DRE unit and the DRE case with SOS numbered seals and document the seal numbers and locations of the seals above. Place the card activator in an SOS pouch and seal and record the seal number above. Place the supervisor cards, voter access cards and the DRE keys in an SOS pouch and seal and record the seal number above. For any other equipment or item required, but not listed above, seal in such a manner so as to make any tampering evident. Sign your name and record the date on each of the seals. Seals must be rubbed hard to ensure an effective seal.

Appendix F
Equipment and Seals Index

County	Equipment or Item Description	Serial Number	Pre-Test Seal Number	Seal Placement	Post-Test Seal Number
Alameda	Diebold DRE	109781	010001	Front Card Key Slot	010321
			010002	Printer Compartment	010196
			010013	On Carton	010197
	Diebold DRE	109877	010005	Front Card Key Slot	010324
			010006	Printer Compartment	010323
			010007	On Carton	010322
Merced	ES&S iVotronic	5120600	010027	Data port	010031
	ES&S iVotronic	5119596	010028	Data port	010032
	Communications Pack	CP03001545	010029	Seal Case	010030
Napa	Sequoia AVC Edge	19992	010040	Cartridge Cover & Button	010224
			010041	Polls Door	010225
			010042	Case	010221
	Sequoia AVC Edge	19995	010043	Cartridge Cover & Button	010222
			010044	Polls Door	010223
			010045	Case	010220
	Card Activator	096082011-010	010046	Card Slot	010219
	Activator Bag		010047	Zipper	010218
	Cards		010048	Across Card Stack	-----
Orange	JBC	C00062	010053	MBB Door	010234
			010054	Serial Port	010226
			010056	Modem Port	010227
			010057	Outside Box	010233
	Hart eSlate	A02FE8	010058	Outside Box	010232
			010059	Outside Box	010231
	Hart eSlate	A03E2B	010060	Outside Box	010230
			010061	Outside Box	010229
Plumas	Diebold DRE	100686	010014	Card Slot	010308
			010015	Printer Key Slot	010307
			010016	Memory Card Lock	010306
			010017	Carton/Booth	010309
	Diebold DRE	100551	010018	Card Slot	010206
			010019	Printer Key Slot	010207
			010020	Memory Card Lock	010208
			010021	Carton/Booth	010209
	Pouch (supervisor & voter cards, keys, encoder)		010022	On zipper	010210

County	Equipment or Item Description	Serial Number	Pre-Test Seal Number	Seal Placement	Post-Test Seal Number
Riverside	Sequoia AVC Edge	4550	010066	Poll Open/Close	010292
			010067	Port	010293
			010068	Outside Box	010294
			010069	Outside Box	010295
	Pouch for Card Activator, voter cards	0096107011	010070	Outside the Pouch	010296
	Sequoia AVC Edge	1722	010072	Poll Open/Close	010286
			010073	Port	010287
			010074	Outside Box	010288
			010075	Outside Box	010289
San Bernardino	Card Activator (and 25 voter access cards)	096082001-019	10079	Outside of Bag on Zipper	010246
	Sequoia AVC Edge	29623	010081	Open/Close	010253
			010082	Memory Port	010254
			010083	Outside Case	010255
			010084	Outside Case	010301
	Sequoia AVC Edge	30452	010085	Open/Close	010249
			010086	Memory Port	010250
			010087	Outside Case	010251
			010088	Outside Case	010252
Santa Clara	Sequoia AVC Edge	25256	010092	Pools Open/Close	-----
			010093	Results Cartridge Door	-----
			010094	AVC Edge Case	010261
			010095	AVC Edge Case	010262
	Sequoia AVC Edge	25260	010096	Pools Open/Close	-----
			010097	Results Cartridge Door	-----
			010098	AVC Edge Case	010259
			010099	AVC Edge Case	010260
	Card Activator	CA 2105	010100	Activator Slot	010257
	Voter Cards		010101	Voter Card Box	-----
	Card Activator Bag		010102	Bag	010258

County	Equipment or Item Description	Serial Number	Pre-Test Seal Number	Seal Placement	Post-Test Seal Number
Shasta	Sequoia AVC Edge	19842	010105	Results Cartridge Door	-----
			010106	Pools Open/Close	-----
			010107	Card Slot	-----
			010108	Top of Case	010318
	Sequoia AVC Edge	19844	010109	Results Cartridge Door	-----
			010110	Pools Open/Close	-----
			010111	Card Slot	-----
			010112	Top of Case	010319
	Card Activator	03041625HCM	010113	Card Slot	010316
	19 Voter Cards		010114	Activator bag	010317
Tehama	Sequoia AVC Edge	19842	010118	Results Cartridge Door	010335
			010119	Pools Open/Close	010276
			010120	Activator Card Slot	010277
			010121	Case	010278
	Sequoia AVC Edge	21850	010122	Results Cartridge Door	010331
			010123	Pools Open/Close	010332
			010124	Activator Card Slot	010333
			010125	Case	010334
	Card Activator	4112	101126	Card Slot	010279
	Activator Cards		010127	Packaged Sealed	-----
	Activator Bag		010128	Bag Zipper	010280

Appendix G

Parallel Monitoring Program Procedures

Parallel Monitoring Program
November 2, 2004 General Election
Program Overview and Procedures

Introduction

Current federal, state, and county accuracy testing of Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting systems occurs prior to election and does not mirror actual voting conditions. The Parallel Monitoring Program has been developed as a supplement to the current accuracy testing processes. The goal of the Parallel Monitoring Program is to determine the presence of malicious code by testing the accuracy of the machines to record, tabulate, and report votes using a sample of DRE equipment in selected counties under actual voting conditions on an election day.

All ten (10) counties utilizing DRE voting systems certified and installed in California and used in polling place voting will be participating in Parallel Monitoring Program for the November 2004 General Election.

The ten counties participating in the Program on November 2, 2004 are:

- Alameda
- Merced
- Napa
- Orange
- Plumas
- Riverside
- San Bernardino
- Santa Clara
- Shasta
- Tehama

Equipment Selection

A. Two (2) DRE units will be selected for testing in each county. Selection of voting equipment in each of the counties will be determined by random, utilizing a random number generator software tool to eliminate human error or bias.

   In counties where the DRE equipment is pre-programmed and/or pre-assigned to a specific precinct, two units in the selected precinct will be identified.

   In counties where the DRE equipment is not pre-programmed and/or pre-assigned to a specific precinct, selection will be accomplished by randomly selecting two numbers from the total number of DRE units in the county inventory.

B. Voting equipment selected for testing will be fully operational, prepared for the November 2, 2004 Election by the county, and accessible for selection prior to November 2nd and for testing on November 2nd.

C. Representatives from the Secretary of State's (SOS) office will travel to and meet with the county election official (or designee) at a mutually agreed upon day and time for the purpose of identifying and securing selected DRE equipment and other equipment necessary to conduct the testing on November 2, 2004. Voting equipment will be selected after the devices have been programmed and sealed against tampering according to normal county procedures and before distribution to polling places.

D. The Secretary of State representative will attach tamper evident, serially numbered security labels on the selected voting equipment to identify the equipment as part of the Parallel Monitoring Program and to provide addition protection against tampering.

E. Equipment name, firmware version, serial number and a confirmation that the equipment has been prepared according to County procedures and the Election Code will be documented and the county election official (or designee) will be asked to verify the information as accurate.

The equipment will then be segregated from the balance of the county inventory and secured on the county premises for housing until November 2, 2004. Encoders or voter card activators, voter access cards, supervisor cards, and other items necessary for testing will also be secured and remain on the county premises.

The Secretary of State representative and county election official (or designee) will agree on a secure, appropriately equipped location with controlled access, within the county election's main office to conduct the testing on November 2, 2004. The Secretary of State requests that the room provide adequate lighting, power, tables for equipment and testing supplies, chairs, etc.

Secretary of State staff will provide assistance in securing voting system components to replace components selected for the Parallel Monitoring Program for those counties that request such assistance. Counties interested in receiving this assistance are requested to contact Michael Wagaman no later than September 30, 2004.

Testing Approach

A. A testing approach has been created to provide a framework for developing test scripts, defining the roles and training of testers, observers and team leaders, documenting testing activity and discrepancy reporting, equipment security and tracking test artifacts.

B. The Secretary of State staff will compile a list of precincts in each of the counties and each county will be requested to verify the accuracy of the list. Within each of the counties one precinct will be identified utilizing a random number generator computer software tool to eliminate human error or bias. The election official in each county will be requested to provide the official ballot of the selected precinct. The ballot will provide the foundation for the development of test scripts used in that county.

Test Team Composition and Training

A. Testing teams will be comprised of 60 individuals including Secretary of State employees, independent consultants and videographers. Each county team will consist of six to seven team members, at least one (1) of which will be a Secretary of State employee.

B. The County election official will be informed of the names, roles and employment affiliation of all individuals who will be conducting testing activities in their counties on November 2, 2004. Information will be submitted to each county not later than October 26, 2004. The parties understand that last minute substitutions may be necessary due to circumstances outside the control of the Secretary of State. If such a substitution should be necessary, the Secretary of State will notify the county in a timely manner.

C. Team members will be required, at all times while onsite in a county, to display an official Secretary of State badge identifying them as member of the Secretary of State Parallel Monitoring Program team. In addition, team members are required to adhere to county security procedures at all times.

D. Testers will be provided a minimum of four (4) hours of parallel monitoring program training including hands-on training on the voting system they will be assigned to test. In addition, team leaders will be provided an additional 2 hours of training specific to team leader responsibilities.

E. The county election official (or designee) will supply the Secretary of State representative with poll workers instruction materials, including instructions for opening and closing the polling places, activating voter cards and procedures in the event of equipment malfunctions.

Test Execution

A. Test teams will arrive at their assigned county at 5:45 a.m. on November 2, 2004 to meet with the county election official (or designee).

B. In the presence of the county election official (or designee), team members will move, or monitor the movement of, the selected voting system equipment from the county storage area to the agreed upon testing room.

C. The county election official (or designee) and the SOS team leader will inspect the testing room to insure that previously agreed to conditions are met (i.e., adequate lighting, power, tables, chairs, etc).

D. The county election official (or designee) will provide instruction for and will be available to assist or provide guidance on logistical issues while the team is in the county prior to and on November 2, 2004. The election official (or designee) is encouraged, but not required, to oversee the opening and closing of the polls.

E. Test teams will follow a specific test schedule that identifies set times of executing the test scripts on each DRE unit. The schedule provides for 9.25 hours of testing over a 13-hour period. All testing activity will be video recorded.

F. During the course of the testing, the teams will complete a discrepancy report for each deviation from the test script and/or test process and for any issues related to equipment malfunction.

G. At the completion of the testing (the closing of the polls) each team will produce the closing tally report for their assigned DRE unit(s) in the presence of the county election official (or designee). The test teams will not reconcile the tally tapes in the field and will have no knowledge of the expected outcomes. The tally tapes and memory cards will be secured in a pouch sealed with a tamper evident security label and will be returned to the Secretary of State, Sacramento office.

H. Tamper evident seals will be applied to the equipment and the county election official (or designee) will escort the SOS team leader and the equipment back to the secure storage area. The equipment will remain in secured storage until such time as directed by the Secretary of State.

I. The county election official and the SOS team leader will sign a form documenting the transfer of the equipment back to the County's secured housing area, the location and the time.

Program Results

A. The analysis of the data and the reconciliation of actual to expected results will begin on November 3, 2004. The analysis will include a review of the tally tapes and Discrepancy Reports for all counties and the videotapes, as necessary, to determine the source of all discrepancies.

B. A summary of results of the reconciliation analysis of the DRE equipment tested on November 2, 2004 will be compiled and made available to the participating counties not later than November 23, 2004.

Other Considerations

A. The county election official (or designee) may assign county staff to observe the Parallel Monitoring team on November 2, 2004. The Secretary of State does request, however, that observers do not distract the testers during the course of the testing activity.

B. The county election official (or designee) shall determine what, if any, other observers, including but not limited to members of the press, they wish to allow observe the parallel monitoring team on November 2, 2004. The Secretary of State does request, however, that observers do not distract the testers during the course of the testing activity.

C. The county election official (or designee) may utilize reserves to replace DRE units and/or card activators/encoders selected for use in the Parallel Monitoring Program.

D. The county election official (or designee) maintains the right to inspect any and all film, personnel, bags or equipment brought on or removed from county premises.

E. In the event of a breach of seals the county election official (or designee) may request that the Secretary of State randomly select a unit(s) from its reserves and continue with the test and document the change consistent with testing protocol.

F. Testing artifacts removed from a county site will be returned to the county within 90 days of the completion of testing or at such other time as may be determined by the Secretary of State. If the Secretary of State retains the artifacts beyond 90 days, the counties will be reimbursed for the cost of the artifact(s) retained by the Secretary of State. Testing artifacts will include, but may not be limited to, DRE memory cards, voter cards, and supervisor cards.

G. The county election official (or designee) may request that a copy be made of the test scripts used in the testing of the DRE equipment in their county and the tally tapes or printed material generated as a part of the test activities. The county election official (or designee) may make copies of the above on November 2, 2004 once testing activity is completed and all test equipment has been sealed and secured in the storage area. At all times, all testing artifacts will remain in full view of the SOS team leader If the county election official (or designee) requests a second DRE tally tape be generated, such tape will be generated and given to the county official on November 2, 2004 after the required testing artifacts have been generated and secured by the SOS team leader.

H. The county official (or designee) may also request copies of the videotapes made during to the course of testing activities. Such tapes will be duplicated after November 3, 2004 and will be distributed to the requesting counties as soon as practicable.

I. The county official (or designee) may also request that a back up or secondary memory card be made of the memory cards removed by the testing teams. For those systems capable of producing a second memory card, such a card will be produced and given to the county official on November 2, 2004 after the required testing artifacts have been produced and secured by the SOS team leader. For systems not capable of producing a second memory card, the memory cards will be brought to the SOS office, duplicated on a “clean system” after November 3, 2004 and will then be distributed to the requesting counties as soon as practicable.

Reimbursement of Costs Associated with the Program

The Secretary of State’s office shall bear the costs associated with the Parallel Monitoring Program consistent with existing agreements between the participating counties and the Secretary of State. These costs include but are not limited to the replacement and reprogramming of voting system components selected for the Parallel Monitoring Program.

Appendix H
Test Script Characteristics by County

	Alameda	Merced	Napa	Orange	Plumas	Riverside	San Bernardino	Santa Clara	Shasta	Tehama
# of Test Scripts	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101
Variations of Contest Selections # Ballots:										
All Contests	89	90	90	89	87	90	89	90	90	90
Some Contests (Under vote)	10	9	9	10	12	9	10	9	9	9
No Contests (Blank Ballot)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Card Reuse	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
# Contests	28	20	22	27	22	28	25	24	23	23
# Contest Participants/Options	111	86	97	102	92	110	103	114	93	97
# of Common User Situations										
Change on Same Screen	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Change on Next Screen	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Change on Review/Confirmation Screen	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
# Write-In candidates	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	4
All contests and candidates are included for each county; all scripts verified against official ballot.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
All candidate names are spelled correctly	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
A language will be specified for each test script	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Each county includes drop-off rates as follows: 99 ballots contain a vote for President 95 ballots contain a vote for US Senate 84-100 ballots contain votes for propositions 93 ballots contain a vote for a Congressional district 91 ballots contain a vote for a State Senate 90 ballots contain a vote for Assembly District	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Candidate selections are sorted in the same order as the official ballot	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Appendix I
Party Affiliation in the Selected Precinct

	Alameda	Merced	Napa	Orange	Plumas	Riverside	San Bernardino	Santa Clara	Shasta	Tehama
Democrat	**70**	**40**	**52**	**23**	**46**	**28**	**47**	**63**	**46**	**42**
Straight Party	44	23	41	14	29	17	28	38	28	25
SP – 1 to 3	17	11	7	6	11	7	12	16	12	11
Random	9	6	4	3	6	4	7	9	6	6
Republican	**20**	**60**	**42**	**70**	**42**	**67**	**43**	**32**	**52**	**52**
Straight Party	12	36	26	41	24	39	26	19	31	30
SP – 1 to	5	15	10	18	12	18	11	8	13	14
Random	3	9	6	11	6	10	6	5	8	8
Am. Indep.	**3**	**0**	**3**	**3**	**6**	**3**	**7**	**2**	**1**	**3**
Straight Party	2	0	2	2	3	2	4	1	1	2
SP – 1 to 3	1	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	0	1
Random	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Green	**3**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**
Straight Party	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
SP – 1 to 3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Random	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Libertarian	**2**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**
Straight Party	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	1
SP – 1 to 3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Random	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peace and Freedom	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**
Straight Party	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
SP – 1 to 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Random	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Law	**1**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Straight Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SP – 1 to 3	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Random	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Total Ballots	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Appendix J
Contest Drop-Off Rates

Contests	Max. Votes	Total Votes	Percent
President	1000	990	99
US Senate	1000	938	93.8
Propositions	16000	14760	92.25
Cong. Districts	1000	917	91.7
State Senate District	500*	454	90.8
Assembly District	1000	897	89.7

Contest	Alameda	Merced	Napa	Orange	Plumas	Riverside	San Bernardino	Santa Clara	Shasta	Tehama
President	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99
US Senate	91	94	94	94	94	94	94	95	94	94
Propositions	1476	1476	1476	1476	1476	1476	1476	1476	1476	1476
Cong. Distr.	91	93	93	92	87	93	89	93	93	93
State Senate	91	0	0	91	90	91	0	91	0	0
Assembly	89	90	90	89	90	90	89	90	90	90

Proposition	Alameda	Merced	Napa	Orange	Plumas	Riverside	San Bernardino	Santa Clara	Shasta	Tehama
1A	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98
59	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98
60	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98
60A	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97
61	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96	96
62	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95	95
63	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84
64	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	93
65	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
66	91	91	91	91	91	91	91	91	91	91
67	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	89
68	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88
69	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86
70	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86
71	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85
72	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84

* Merced, Napa, San Bernardino, Shasta and Tehama had no State Senate contest

Appendix K

Language Choice by County

County	English		Spanish		Chinese		Tagalog		Vietnamese		Korean		Total
Alameda	91	**91.00%**	3	**3.00%**	6	**6.00%**	0		0	**0.00%**	0		100
American Independent	3	**3.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Democratic	61	**61.00%**	3	**3.00%**	6	**6.00%**	0		0		0		
Green	3	**3.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Libertarian	2	**2.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Natural Law	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Peace and Freedom	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Republican	20	**20.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Merced	99	**99.00%**	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		100
Democratic	39	**39.00%**	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		
Republican	60	**60.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Napa	100	**100.00%**	0	**0.00%**	0	**0.00%**	0	**0.00%**	0	**0.00%**	0	**0.00%**	100
American Independent	3	**3.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Democratic	52	**52.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Green	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Libertarian	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Natural Law	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Republican	42	**42.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Orange	96	**95.00%**	1	**1.00%**	1	**1.00%**	0	**1.00%**	1	**1.00%**	1	**1.00%**	100
American Independent	3	**3.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Democratic	22	**22.00%**	0		1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		
Green			0		0		0		1	**1.00%**	0		
Libertarian	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Natural Law	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Peace and Freedom	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Republican	68	**68.00%**	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		1	**1.00%**	
Plumas	100	**100.00%**	0	**0.00%**	0	**0.00%**	0	**0.00%**	0	**0.00%**	0	**0.00%**	100
American Independent	6	**6.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Democratic	46	**46.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Green	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Libertarian	3	**3.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Natural Law	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Peace and Freedom	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Republican	42	**42.00%**	0		0		0		0		0		
Riverside	99	**99.00%**	1	**1.00%**	0	**0.00%**	0	**0.00%**	0	**0.00%**	0	**0.00%**	100

Language Choice by County

County	English		Spanish		Chinese		Tagalog		Vietnamese		Korean	Total
American Independent	3	**3.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Democratic	27	**27.00%**	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0	
Green	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Natural Law	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Republican	67	**67.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
San Bernardino	99	**99.00%**	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0	100
American Independent	7	**7.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Democratic	47	**47.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Green	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Libertarian	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Peace and Freedom	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Republican	42	**42.00%**	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0	
Santa Clara	81	**81.00%**	2	**2.00%**	2	**2.00%**	4	**4.00%**	11	**11.00%**	0	100
American Independent	1	**1.00%**	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0	
Democratic	54	**54.00%**	0		2	**2.00%**	1	**1.00%**	6	**6.00%**	0	
Green	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Libertarian	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Peace and Freedom			0		0		1	**1.00%**	0		0	
Republican	24	**24.00%**	1	**1.00%**	0		2	**2.00%**	5	**5.00%**	0	
Shasta	100	**100.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	100
American Independent	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Democratic	46	**46.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Libertarian	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Republican	52	**52.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Tehama	100	**100.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	100
American Independent	3	**3.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Democratic	42	**42.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Green	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Libertarian	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Peace and Freedom	1	**1.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Republican	52	**52.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	
Test 101	1	**100.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	100
American Independent	1	**100.00%**	0		0		0		0		0	

Appendix L

Parallel Monitoring Program, Nov, 2004 Election

SECTION 1	County	Vendor	Precinct #	Time Block:	7am - 9am	Test Order
	Alameda	Diebold	244300-00	Actual Start Time:		1
Tester:				Video Operators:		
Observers:						
SECTION 2	Language:	English				

SECTION 3

Step	Action
1	Display Test Order number for video camera
2	Activate a voter card according to the Vendor instructions.
3	Insert the Voter Access Card into the DRE unit.
4	Tester votes according to the script AND initials in the "Select" box as EACH vote selection is made.
5	Tester STOPS at the confirmation screen.
6	Observer reviews the selections made against the script.
	A. If a selection is verified as correct, the Observer initials in the "Verify" box.
	B. If a selection is verified as incorrect the Observer documents the defect by placing their initials in the "Defect" column of the script and informs the tester of the needed correction and completes a discrepancy form for review and sign off by the Team Leader.
	i. The Tester then makes the correction, and STOPS at the confirmation screen.
	ii. The Observer repeats step 6.
7	Once all selections are confirmed as correct, the Tester casts the ballot.

Contest	Selection	Select	Verify	Defect
President	John F. Kerry for President	☐	☐	
U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	☐	☐	
U.S. Representative	Barbara Lee	☐	☐	
State Senate	Don Perata	☐	☐	
State Assembly	Wilma Chan	☐	☐	
School	Cy Gulassa	☐	☐	
District: S. F. BART Director	Bob Franklin	☐	☐	
District Director at Large	H. E. Christian (Chris) Peeples	☐	☐	
District Director Ward 2	Christine A. Zook	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries. Initiative. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 59 - Public Records. Open meetings - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	☐	☐	
State Measures	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	☐	☐	
District: S. F. BART Measur	San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Measure AA - Vote NO	☐	☐	
City - Measure	City of Oakland Measure Y - Vote NO	☐	☐	
City - Measure	City of Oakland Measure Z - Vote YES	☐	☐	
Local Measures	AC Transit Special District 1 Measure BB - Vote YES	☐	☐	
Local Measures	East Bay Regional Park District - Zone 1 Measure CC - Vote NO	☐	☐	

Appendix M
Test Script Options

List A – Ballot Types

Democratic
Republican
American Independent
Green Party
Libertarian Party
Peace and Freedom Party
Natural Law

List B – Voting Language

Korean
Spanish
Chinese
Vietnamese
English
Japanese
Tagalog

List C – Script Types

Every contest on the ballot has a selection – some contests have fewer selections than the maximum.
All contests have votes
Not all contests have votes
No vote for any contest
Card Reuse

List D – Statewide Contests

United States Senator	
Barbara Boxer	Democratic
Bill Jones	Republican
Don J. Grundmann	American Independent
James P. "Jim" Gray	Libertarian
Marsha Feinland	Peace and Freedom
Write-In Candidate for Senator; Sen Candidate	

State Propositions
Proposition 1A – Yes
Proposition 1A – No
Proposition 59 – Yes
Proposition 59 – No
Proposition 60 – Yes
Proposition 60 – No
Proposition 60A - Yes
Proposition 60A – No
Proposition 61 – Yes
Proposition 61 – No
Proposition 62 – Yes
Proposition 62 – No
Proposition 63 – Yes
Proposition 63 – No
Proposition 64 – Yes
Proposition 64 – No
Proposition 65 – Yes
Proposition 65 – No
Proposition 66 – Yes
Proposition 66 – No
Proposition 67 – Yes
Proposition 67 – No
Proposition 68 – Yes
Proposition 68 – No
Proposition 69 – Yes
Proposition 69 – No
Proposition 70 – Yes
Proposition 70 – No
Proposition 71 – Yes
Proposition 71 – No
Proposition 72 – Yes
Proposition 72 – No

LIST E –
Legislative/Local Contests (All Precincts)
Derived from the Official Sample Ballots

Alameda
United States Representative
Barbara Lee
Claudia Bermudez
Jim Eyer
Write In Candidate for U.S. House of Representative; US House Candidate
State Senator
Don Perata
Patricia Deutsche
Peter Von Pinnon
Tom Condit
Write In Candidate for State Senator; St. Senator Candidate
State Assembly
Jerald Udinsky
Wilma Chan
Write in Candidate for State Assembly; St. Assembly Candidate
School
Cy Gulassa
Melanie Sweeney-Griffith
District; S.F. BART Director
Bob Franklin
Kathy Neal
Roy Nakadegawa
District; Director at Large
H. E. Christian (Chris) Peeples
James Karim Muhammad
Rebecca Rae Oliver
District; Director Ward 2
Christine A. Zook
Greg Harper
District; S. F. BART Measure AA
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Measure AA - Vote YES
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Measure AA - Vote NO
City of Oakland
City of Oakland Measure Y - Vote YES
City of Oakland Measure Y - Vote NO
City of Oakland Measure Z - Vote YES

City of Oakland Measure Z - Vote NO
Local Measures
AC Transit Special District 1 Measure BB - Vote YES
AC Transit Special District 1 Measure BB - Vote NO
East Bay Regional Park District - Zone 1 Measure CC - Vote YES
East Bay Regional Park District - Zone 1 Measure CC - Vote NO

Merced	
United States Representative	
Charles F. Pringle	Republican
Dennis A. Cardoza	Democratic
Write In Candidate for U.S. House of Representative; US House Candidate	
State Assembly	
Barbara S. Matthews	
Democratic	
Nellie McGarry	
Republican	
Write in Candidate for State Assembly; St. Assembly Candidate	

Napa	
United States Representative	
Lawrence R. Wiesner	Republican
Mike Thompson	Democratic
Pamela Elizondo	Green
Write In Candidate for U.S. House of Representative; US House Candidate	
State Assembly	
F. Aaron Smith	Libertarian
Noreen Evans	Democratic
Pat Krueger	Republican
Write in Candidate for State Assembly; St. Assembly Candidate	
School	
D. Michael Jack	
Jose Hurtado	
Raymond Beaty	
Local Measures	
Prop T - County Rural Dining Zoning District - Vote YES	
Prop T - County Rural Dining Zoning District - Vote NO	
Prop V - Transient Occupancy Tax - Vote YES	
Prop V - Transient Occupancy Tax - Vote NO	
Prop W - Jamieson Canyon Road "Advisory Vote Only" - Vote YES	
Prop W - Jamieson Canyon Road "Advisory Vote Only" - Vote NO	

Orange	
U.S. House	
Gary G. Miller	Republican
Lewis Myers	Democratic
Write In Candidate for U.S. House of Representative; US House Candidate	
State Senator	
Dick Ackerman	Republican
Randall Daugherty	Democratic
Write In Candidate for State Senator; St. Senator Candidate	
State Assembly	
Bea Foster	Democratic
Todd Spitzer	Republican
Write in Candidate for State Assembly; St. Assembly Candidate	
School - Trustee Area 3	
Gary V. Miller	
William (Bill) Jay	
School – Trustee Area 7	
John S. Williams	
Kevin S. Thompson	
City	
Brad Morton	
Dan Joseph	
Frank Ury	
Gail Reavis	
Nancy Howell	
District	
Bill Vanderwerff	
Ergun (Eric) Bakall	
Jeffery M. Thomas	
Local Measures	
Prop K - Transient Occupancy Tax. - Vote YES	
Prop K - Transient Occupancy Tax. - Vote NO	

Plumas	
U.S. Representative	
David I. Winters	Democratic
John T. Doolittle	Republican
Write In Candidate for U.S. House of Representative; US House Candidate	
State Senator	
Dave Cox	Republican

Kristine Lang McDonald	Democratic
Roberto Leibman	Libertarian
Write In Candidate for State Senator; St. Senator Candidate	
State Assembly	
Rick Keene	Republican
Robert A. Woods	Democratic
Robert Burk	Libertarian
Write in Candidate for State Assembly; St. Assembly Candidate	
School	
John Sheehan	
Luiz G. Gutierrez	
City	
Dick Dickerson	
Ken Murray	
Mary Leas Stegall	
Patrick Henry Jones	
City Treasurer, Shasta	
Allyn Feci Clark	

Riverside	
U.S. Representative	
Mary Bono	Republican
Richard J. Meyer	Democratic
Write In Candidate for U.S. House of Representative; US House Candidate	
State Senator	
Jim Battin	Republican
Pat Johansen	Democratic
Write In Candidate for State Senator; St. Senator Candidate	
State Assembly	
Bonnie Garcia	Republican
Mary Ann Andreas	Democratic
Write in Candidate for State Assembly; St. Assembly Candidate	
Judicial	
Sarah Adams Christian	
Shaffer T. Cormell	
Districts	
Patricia "Corky" Larson	
Roy Carl Klopfenstein	
School - Trustee Area 2	
Charles "Chuck" Hayden	
E. Allen Keeney	

School – Trustee Area 3
Annette O. Harvey
Merle C. "Bud" Miller
Sonja S. Marchand
Desert Sands School District
Carl Mc Peters
Clark Mc Cartney
Ellen C. Burr
Gary Tomak
Marie J. Santana
Matt Monica
Neil D. Lingle
Patrick Runyon
City – Mayor
Don Adolph
City – Council
Ken Napper
Lee M. Osborne
Robert G. Cox
Stanley Sniff

San Bernardino	
U.S. Representative	
Fred "Tim" Willoughby	Democratic
Howard P. "Buck" McKeon	Republican
Write In Candidate for U.S. House of Representative; US House Candidate	
State Assembly	
Bill Maze	Republican
Maggie Florez	Democratic
Write in Candidate for State Assembly; St. Assembly Candidate	
City - Mayor, Barstow	
Bud Campbell	
Carmen M. Hernandez	
Helen K. Runyon	
Lawrence E. Dale	
Nathaniel H. Pickett	
City - Council, Barstow	
Joe D. Gomez	
Lance Milanez	
Lucille Stanson	
Manuel Gilbert Gurule	
Patrick (Pat) Aleman	

Paul Luellig
Susan Wyman
City - Clerk, Barstow
Joanne (JoJo) Cousino
Laura Moraco
City - Treasurer, Barstow
Evelyn Radel
Local Measures
Measure I - Vote YES
Measure I - Vote NO

Santa Clara	
U.S. Representative	
Douglas Adams McNea	Republican
Markus Welch	Libertarian
Zoe Lofgren	Democratic
Write In Candidate for U.S. House of Representative; US House Candidate	
State Senate	
Elaine Alquist	Democratic
Michael Laursen	Libertarian
Shane Patrick Connolly	Republican
Write In Candidate for State Senator; St. Senator Candidate	
State Assembly	
Joe Coto	Democratic
Mark Patrosso	Republican
Warner S. Bloomberg 3rd	Green
Write in Candidate for State Assembly; St. Assembly Candidate	
Judicial	
Enrique Colin	
Griffin Bonini	
School	
Cecil Lawson	
Craig Mann	
Juanita Ramirez	
Khanh D. Tran	
Lan Nguyen	
Theresa (Terri) A. Horiye	
Xavier Campos	
Local Measures	
Measure A - Vote YES	
Measure A - Vote NO	

Measure B - Vote YES
Measure B - Vote NO
Measure C - Vote YES
Measure C - Vote NO
Measure G - Vote YES
Measure G - Vote NO
Measure K - Vote YES
Measure K - Vote NO
Measure N - Vote YES
Measure N - Vote NO
Measure S - Vote YES
Measure S - Vote NO

Shasta	
U.S. Representative	
Mike Johnson	Democratic
Wally Herger	Republican
Write In Candidate for U.S. House of Representative; US House Candidate	
State Assembly	
Barbara McIver	Democratic
Doug La Malfa	Republican
Write in Candidate for State Assembly; St. Assembly Candidate	
County	
Mark Cibula	
Stanley Scott Leach	
City	
Dick Dickerson	
Ken Murray	
Mary Leas Stegall	
Patrick Henry Jones	
City Treasurer, Shasta	
Allyn Feci Clark	

Tehama	
U.S. Representative	
Mike Johnson	Democratic
Wally Herger	Republican
Write In Candidate for U.S. House of Representative; US House Candidate	
State Assembly	
Barbara McIver	Democratic

Doug La Malfa	Republican
Write in Candidate for State Assembly; St. Assembly Candidate	
School - Board of Education	
Gary Lloyd Taylor	
Thomas E. Moisey	
School	
Bob Steinacher	
Daniel A. Salado	
Janine Wallan	
Local Measures	
Measure A - Vote YES	
Measure A - Vote NO	
Measure B - Vote YES	
Measure B - Vote NO	
Measure C - Vote YES	
Measure C - Vote NO	

List F – Common Voter Errors

Key stroke error - change selection while on the same screen
Key stroke error - change selection after advancing 1 screen
Key stroke error - change selection when on the final view/summary screen

Appendix N
Team Member Index

County	Name	Organization	Role
	Jocelyn Whitney	Consultant	R&G Project Manager
	Michael Wagaman	Secretary of State	SOS Co-Project Managers
	Steve Kawano	Secretary of State	
	Stephanie Golka	Consultant	Project Team Member
Alameda	Karl Dolk	Consultant	Team Leader
Alameda	Kathleen Lane	Consultant	Tester/Observer
Alameda	Susan Buki	Consultant	Tester/Observer
Alameda	Leonard Larson	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Alameda	Paul Denton	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Alameda	Jonathan Lawrence	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Merced	Stephanie Golka	Consultant	Team Leader
Merced	Linda Van Dyke	Consultant	Tester/Observer
Merced	Steve Kawano	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Merced	Larry Gennette	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Merced	James Rotondo	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Merced	David Arnold	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Napa	Chuck Moore	Consultant	Team Leader
Napa	Michael Karnadi	Consultant	Tester/Observer
Napa	Dana Stinson	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Napa	Roy Allmond	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Napa	Brian Kendall	Kendall Concepts	Video Operator
Napa	Kate Kendall	Kendall Concepts	Video Operator
Napa	Seth Binnix	Kendall Concepts	Video Operator
Orange	Dave Hahn	Consultant	Team Leader
Orange	Vince Hoban	Consultant	Tester/Observer
Orange	Denise Castellano	Consultant	Tester/Observer
Orange	Cynthia Willis	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Orange	Judy Willis	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Orange	Trey Solberg	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Orange	Troy Witt	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Plumas	Jack Falk	Consultant	Team Leader
Plumas	Lynda Allen	Consultant	Tester/Observer
Plumas	Janice White	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Plumas	Marcia Moreno	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Plumas	Tom Simrak	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Plumas	Nick Pavlosky	South Coast Studios	Video Operator

Riverside	Nick Wolf	Consultant	Team Leader
Riverside	Adam Watts	Consultant	Tester/Observer
Riverside	Paul Roberts	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Riverside	Nancy Rembulat	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Riverside	Mike Gallagher	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Riverside	Nick Dustin	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
San Bernardino	Gail Estrella	Consultant	Team Leader
San Bernardino	Chin May Wong	Consultant	Tester/Observer
San Bernardino	Tom Neal	Consultant	Tester/Observer
San Bernardino	Justin Wilhelm	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
San Bernardino	Dean Tapia	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
San Bernardino	Mike Sanchez	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Santa Clara	Marini Ballard	Consultant	Team Leader
Santa Clara	Janel Prince	Consultant	Tester/Observer
Santa Clara	Blaine Lamb	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Santa Clara	Miguel Castillo	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Santa Clara	Mike Kuehner	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Santa Clara	Bob Allen	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Shasta	Nicholas Wozniak	Consultant	Team Leader
Shasta	Debbie Knight	Consultant	Tester/Observer
Shasta	Jason Fanner	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Shasta	Don Tresca	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Shasta	Andy Cauble	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Shasta	Toby Wallwork	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Tehama	Mark Havenor	Consultant	Team Leader
Tehama	Thomas Winslow	Consultant	Tester/Observer
Tehama	Rolando Torres	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Tehama	Stephanie Hamashin	Secretary of State	Tester/Observer
Tehama	Bob Knaggs	South Coast Studios	Video Operator
Tehama	Don Pearsall	South Coast Studios	Video Operator

Appendix O

Secretary of State
Parallel Monitoring Program
Training Agenda
October 29, 2004

Second Floor Board Room

Session 1 8:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. All Testers and Alternate Testers

Session 2 1:30 – 4:00 p.m. Team Leaders and Alternate Team Leaders

Session 1

8:00 – 10:00 a.m. All testers (Including alternates and lead testers)

1. Introductions
2. Parallel Monitoring Program Overview
   a. Testing Overview
   b. Team Composition and Roles
   c. Testing Activities Overview
   d. Documenting Testing Activity
3. Security Protocols
4. Travel Information

10:00 – 10:15 a.m. Break

10:15 – 11:45 a.m. Convene for vendor system demonstrations

1. Diebold Election Systems Room 385
2. Election Systems and Software Room 480
3. Hart InterCivic Room 580
4. Sequoia Voting Systems 2nd Floor Board Room

11:45 – 12:30 Re-convene in Second Floor Board Room for wrap up
12:30 Adjourn

Session 2

1:30 – 3:00 Team Leaders and Alternate Team Leaders only

1. Documenting Testing Activities
   a. Activity Checklist
   b. Test Equipment Security and Chain of Custody Instructions and Forms
   c. Discrepancy Reporting Instructions and Forms
   d. Test Artifact Retention and Documentation
2. General Security and Protocols
   a. Protocols for interacting with County Election Officials, employees, the press and other observers
   b. Scheduled Contact with SOS
   c. Marc Carrel, Assistant Secretary of State for Policy, Planning and Legislation – security protocols

Appendix P

Secretary of State
Parallel Monitoring Program
November 2004 General Election

Video Operator Responsibilities and Instructions

Responsibility

The video operators play a vital role in ensuring the success of the Secretary of State Parallel monitoring Program.

Once the casting of "votes" on the DRE units is accomplished on November 2, 2004 the results will be analyzed for discrepancies. The videotapes provide the mechanism by which the Secretary of State staff identifies and determines the cause of discrepancies. The quality and clarity of the videotapes are **critical** to the Parallel Monitoring Program.

Not later than **October 25, 2004**, the video company will notify Mr. Steve Kawano in writing of the names and phone numbers of the individuals that will be assigned to each of the counties and the name of the individual who will be in charge of the video operations in each of the counties. Upon receipt of this information, Mr. Kawano will provide you with Team Leader's name and contact information for each county.

Each video operator assigned to a county will read the Parallel Monitoring Program Procedures and these instructions. If any part of the Procedures or these instructions is unclear it is the responsibility of the video operator to contact the Mr. Steve Kawano, Secretary of State, Elections Division at (916) 653-2744 for clarification prior to **October 25, 2004**.

Instructions

November 1, 2004

The Video operator will make contact with the Team Leader assigned to the county they are responsible for no later that 5:00 p.m. on November 1, 2004 to confirm the time and place to meet on the morning of November 2, 2004 for the Parallel Monitoring Program testing.

November 2, 2004

1. Video operators will meet the Team Leader and team members at the county at the designated place and time.

2. Video operators will wear an SOS provided security badge at all times while on county premises and will comply with all security related instructions of the Team Leader.

3. Voting system components will be moved from the storage room to testing room. Once in the testing room, the video operators will tape set-up of voting machines including breaking of all security seals, activation of machine and running of the "zero tape".

4. Video operators will then set-up camera to capture activity as described below:

    a. Video operator will tape stationary screen throughout the course of the day beginning precisely at 7:00 a.m. (opening of the polls) regardless of whether the test team is ready to begin the testing or not.

    b. The camera shall remain focused on the DRE unit screen at all times with the exception of changing tapes. **All testing activity on the DRE unit shall STOP while tapes are changed and labeled.**

    c. The DRE unit screen must be in focus in such a manner that upon replay of the video tape each test number and the casting of each vote can be clearly identified as to a contest and candidate selection. In addition, for each ballot cast (101 in total for each DRE unit), the video operator shall ensure the review and confirmation screen (at the end of each ballot) is fully viewable as to each specific contest and each candidate selection.

    d. The video operator is responsible for ensuring that glare, a tester's hand or any other interference does not obscure any detail of each "vote" cast. The test number, contest and candidate selected must be clearly visible upon replay of the tape.

    e. Video operator will ensure that a time/date stamp is present on tape.

    f. As each tape is completed, video operator will clearly label the tape using labels provided by Team Leader. Each label will document:
        i. The County
        ii. Tape Start time
        iii. Tape End time
        iv. Video Operator name
        v. Team Leader name
        vi. Serial Number of the DRE Unit being recorded

5. The video operator will continue taping until the testing activity has been completed and then will video tape the closing of the voting machines included the printing of tally tapes and attachment of security seals.

6. Copies of all videotapes will then be given to the Team Leader.

Appendix Q

Parallel Monitoring Program
November 2, 2004 General Election
Testing Activity Checklist

This checklist is intended to ensure all activities are accomplished in a timely manner. As an activity is accomplished the team leader will initial the "Complete" column. Note that some of the activities noted below must be performed for **BOTH** DRE units.

	Monday, November 1, 2004	**Complete**
1	Team lead picks up testing materials at SOS (e.g. test script binder, team member badges)	
2	Team members travel to assigned county.	
3	The video operators assigned to the county will call and check in with the team lead not later than 5 p.m. Team lead will confirm with video operators that they are to meet at the designated county entrance in the morning (November 2nd) no later than 5:45 a.m.	
4	Each team member will check in with the team lead at 7 p.m.	
5	Team lead will instruct members to meet in the hotel lobby in the morning at a specified time.	
6	Team lead calls the SOS contact, not later than 7:30 to confirm that all team members are present in the assigned county and prepared for testing in the morning.	
	Tuesday, November 2, 2004	
7	Team members meet in hotel lobby at the time specified the previous evening by the team lead.	
8	Team lead ensures all team members are present, distributes SOS PMP badges and ensures badges are visible on the outside of clothing. All cells phones are **OFF**, with the exception of the **team lead who will ensure that his/her cell phone is ON and that he/she can be reached at all times** during the course of the day.	
9	Test team travels to assigned county and arrives no later than 6:00 a.m.	
10	Video operators join the team at the county and the team leads distributes badges to them.	
11	Designated entrance for this county is: 12th Street Courthouse door (on 12th between Fallon and Oak)	

12	Team leader requests to meet county representative: Nancy Fenton, Deputy County Counsel Contact Number for Representative is: (510) 272-6970 or (510) 272-6900	
13	Team lead and County Representative discuss and the team lead documents the following. 1. Confirms the following security procedures: a. Testers will display an official SOS Parallel Monitoring Program badge at all times. b. Testers will abide by county security procedures communicated to them. 2. Does the county representative wish: a. To be present at the time the "Zero Tally Tape" is generated? (if so, how will you contact them?) b. To be present when the "Tally Tape" is generated? c. Us to generate a second "Tally Tape"? 3. Does the county representative wish to have copies of: a. Test scripts (provided on Nov. 2, 2004 after testing is complete). b. Zero Tape (copy may be made on Nov. 2, 2004 after testing is complete). c. Tally Tape (copy may be made Nov. 2, 2004 after testing is complete or if the equipment is capable, a second "tally Tape" can be generated once the initial tape is generated and secured in the provided SOS security pouch). d. Memory card (will be provided after Nov. 3, 2004 from the office of the SOS—if the County Representative requests a copy before the card is returned to the SOS, please call your SOS contact). e. Video Tapes (provided after Nov. 3, 2004 from the SOS office). If copies are requested of any testing artifact the team lead will accompany the county representative and will, at all times, have visual contact with the testing artifact. The original testing artifact will be returned to the team lead and secured consistent with the Program procedures.	
14	Team is escorted to equipment storage location and moves, or monitors the movement of, test equipment to the testing room. For counties allowing observation, please refer to the Observer Guidelines.	
15	Video operator labels the recording media with the SOS Parallel Monitoring Program label.	
16	Video operator sets up the cameras to film seal security verification activity, ensuring the video camera clock is accurate.	
17	Team lead completes the *Equipment Security and Chain of Custody* -- **Section I**, *Pre-Test Equipment Security Verification*.	

	1. Record the location the equipment was moved from. 2. Document the results of an examination of the tamper evident seals and the serial numbers of the DRE equipment. a. If seals show no indication of tampering and the serial numbers are consistent the lead will document this, sign the form and proceed with testing activity. b. If a seal shows evidence of tampering or there is a discrepancy with a serial number, the team lead will document this, sign the form, ask the video operator to capture the discrepancy on tape and will then immediately call the SOS contact for further instructions.	
18	Refer to the Poll Workers Guide and set up the voting equipment.	
19	Team members organize room for testing activities (arrange table, chairs, supplies, etc.). Video operators set up cameras so as to capture unobstructed view of DRE screen at all times. Begin video recording DRE screen & record time here: _____	
20	Power on equipment. Record the software version displayed on the DRE here: _____	
21	If the county representative has requested they be present for the generation of the "Zero Tape" let them know you are preparing to do this task.	
22	Refer to the Poll Workers guide for instructions on generating the "Zero Tally Tape" for each DRE.	
23	Generate the "Zero tally Tape".	
24	Place the "Zero Tally Tape" in the designated SOS Testing Artifacts pouch.	
Open the Polls – Testing Begins at 7:00 a.m.		
25	**Commence testing promptly at 7:00 a.m. – do not start early even if the team is ready.** Call your SOS contact to report the "Opening of the Polls". If testing does not commence at 7:00 a.m. note the reason why the team is late below and complete a *Discrepancy Report*.	
26	Conduct testing as instructed, complete discrepancy reports for any deviation from the test script, testing process, or equipment malfunction.	
27	Call your SOS contact if an issue arises that halts testing or impacts test results. Refer to the Discrepancy Reporting Instructions.	
28	Conduct a scheduled status call to the SOS contact at 9:35 am.	
29	Conduct a scheduled status call to the SOS contact at 11:35 am.	
30	Conduct a scheduled status call to the SOS contact at 2:35 pm.	
31	Conduct a scheduled status call to the SOS contact at 5:35 pm.	
Close the Polls – Testing ends at 8:00 p.m.		
32	Execute test scripts according to instructions until 8:00 p.m. Do not "close the polls" before 8:00 p.m. even if you have completed all the test scripts. If testing has not been completed, finish the script you are working on and then stop. Complete a Discrepancy Report indicating what test order number(s) you were unable to complete.	
Documentation of Testing Activities		
33	If the county representative has requested that they be present for the generation of the "Tally Tape" let them know you are preparing to do this task.	
34	Refer to the Poll Workers guide for closing the polls and generating a "Tally Tape".	
35	Generate the "Tally Tape".	
36	Place the "Tally Tape" in the designated SOS Testing Artifacts pouch.	

37	If the county representative has requested you generate a second "Tally Tape" do this now. Mark the tally tape with the DRE unit serial number, the time, date, your initials and "PMP Second Tally Tape".	
38	Follow the instructions for removing the DRE unit "Memory Card".	
39	Secure the "Memory Card" in the designated SOS Testing Artifacts pouch.	
40	Team lead completes the *Equipment Security and Chain of Custody* -- **Section 2**, *Post-Test Equipment Security Documentation*. 1. Record a brief description of the equipment/item, the serial number (if any) and the serial number & placement of the SOS security seal (the form may be completed for you, if it is, verify that the information is accurate). 2. Record the storage location to which the equipment will be moved. 3. The lead tester and the county representative must sign this form.	
41	Team Lead completes the *Equipment Security and Chain of Custody* -- **Section 3**, *County Items to be Retained*. 1. Record a brief description of the equipment/item, the serial number (if any) and the serial number & placement of the SOS security seal (the form may be completed for you, if it is, verify that the information is accurate). 2. The lead tester and the county representative must sign this form.	
42	Move, or monitor the movement of, the testing equipment back to the secure storage area.	
43	Deliver a copy of the "County Test Scripts Binder" to the county representative, if the SOS provided this to you.	
44	Team lead completes the *Test Artifact Inventory Checklist* ensuring all artifacts are inventoried, secured and returned to the Secretary of State. Items will be placed in the SOS Testing Artifacts pouch provided. The top of the pouch will be folded over and a SOS security Seal will be sealed over the flap. Indicate the security seal number here: _____ **NOTE:** This form is to be completed and inserted in the pouch as well.	
45	Call SOS Contact to report the testing activities are complete, the team is leaving the county premises and confirm your meeting time with J. Whitney on November 3, 2004.	
Wednesday, November 3, 2004 –Return testing Artifacts to Sacramento at the appointed time.		

Signatures

Team Lead: Karl Dolk _____

Team Member: Kathleen Lane _____

Team Member: Susan Buki _____

Team Member: Leonard Larson _____

SOS Contacts

Primary Jocelyn Whitney (916) 654-0298 or (916) 501-5588
Secondary Michael Wagaman (916) 653-5534 or (916) 203-8514

Appendix R

Parallel Monitoring Program
November 2, 2004
Equipment Security and Chain of Custody
Instructions and Forms

Introduction

The Equipment Security and Chain of Custody is used to document the condition of the tamper-evident seals previously applied to the equipment and to document the movement of the test equipment from the storage area into the testing room and back to the storage area once testing is complete. In addition, the form will be used to document the County items that will be temporarily retained by the Secretary of State.

Section 1 - Pre-Test Equipment Security Verification

The Pre-Test Equipment Security Verification is used to document the condition of the previously applied tamper-evident security seals and to document the movement of the test equipment from the storage area into the testing room.

1. Record the specific room name and/or location where you are escorted to pick up the equipment (e.g. the ballot vault, the server room).

2. Examine the equipment and check the seals for evidence of tampering. Compare the serial number of the equipment and the serial numbers of the seals and check if they are consistent with the information recorded on the form. If the seals show no evidence of tampering and the serial numbers are consistent with the table, document that information on the form and move the equipment to the testing room.

3. If there is evidence of tampering and/or the equipment serial numbers are not consistent with the form call your SOS contact for further instructions.

Section 2 – Post Test Equipment Security Documentation

1. The Post-Test Equipment Security Record is used to document the serial number of the security seal applied to the equipment after testing has been completed. It will also document the movement of the equipment from the testing room to a secure area where the equipment will be temporarily housed until directed by the Secretary of State.

2. Record the serial number of each piece of equipment or item and the serial number and placement of the seals and/or labels applied by the team.

3. Record the room name and/or location where you are instructed by the county representative to place the equipment (e.g. the ballot vault, the server room).

Section 3 - County items to be Retained

This section is used to inventory each county item that will be temporarily retained by the Secretary of State.

1. The "Item Description" column should be completed with a short description and/or name of the equipment or item to be retained and the number of that item to be retained (e.g. one Memory Card, ten voter access cards, one supervisor card).

2. Record the serial number of each item (if available) and the serial number and placement of seals applied by the team (e.g., over the zipper of the pouch).

Section 4 - Signatures

The SOS Representative and the County Representative will print and sign their names. By signing the form the parties are acknowledging that the equipment documented on the form was moved to and from the secured storage room and that the SOS Representative is removing specific County items, as documented on the form, from county premises. These items will either be returned to the county or the Secretary of State will reimburse the county for the cost of the items.

Parallel Monitoring Program

November 2, 2004 General Election

Equipment Security and Chain of Custody

County of _____

Section 1 Pre-Test Equipment Security Verification

Team Leader: _____County Representative: _____

Time: _____

Record the location where the test equipment is stored: _____

Equipment/Item Description and Serial Number	SOS Security Seal of Record	Location of Seal	Is Seal Intact?	Comments

If the seals are intact and the serial numbers are consistent with the information above move the equipment to the testing room and begin set up. If the seals are **NOT** intact and/or the serial numbers are **NOT** consistent with the information above call your SOS contact immediately.

Signature of County Team Lead_____

Section 2 Post-Testing Equipment Security Documentation

Team Leader: _____County Representative: _____

Time: _____

Record the location where the test equipment will be stored: _____

Equipment Description	Serial Number	SOS Security Seal Number	SOS Security Seal Location	Comments

The equipment identified above has been returned to the secured location identified. The equipment is now and will remain in a secured environment with controlled access until directed by the office of the Secretary of State.

Signature of Team Leader: _____Time: _____

Signature of County Representative: _____Time:_____

Section 3 County Items to be Temporarily Retained by the Secretary of State

Team Leader: _____County Representative: _____

Time: _____

Item Description and Serial Number	SOS Security Seal Number	SOS Security Seal Location	Comments

Signature of Team Leader: _____Time: _____

Signature of County Representative: _____Time:_____

Appendix S

Secretary of State

November 2004 Parallel Monitoring Program

Observer Guidelines

1. Observers may request copies of the procedures for the Parallel Monitoring Program by contacting the Secretary of State's press office at (916) 653-6575.

2. Pursuant to the procedures of the Parallel Monitoring Program, the public, including the press, may be allowed to observe the Parallel Monitoring Program in accordance with the policies and procedures of the participating county and considering any security limitations of the room where the Parallel Monitoring Program is conducted.

3. Due to the necessity to ensure a controlled testing environment members of the press and public will not be allowed to interrupt or distract members of the testing teams in any way. Further, those observing the program will be required to maintain strict silence while in the observation room.

4. Members of the SOS testing teams will not be available for discussion or interview before, during or after the testing. All questions should be directed to the county elections official or the Secretary of State's office at (916) 653-6575.

5. Members of the testing team will be executing test scripts on November 2, 2004. While team members will generate and secure the totals tallied by the voting machine, they will not have access to the expected results for comparison. Analysis of the data will begin November 3, 2004.

Appendix T
November 2, 2004 Events Log

County	Name	Contact Number	Contact Description	Open Polls	Breaks	Close Polls
Alameda	**Karl Dolk** Kathleen Lane Susan Buki Leonard Larson	[redacted]	**11-1-04** 4:30 p.m. Notified of change to larger room. N Fenton will meet testers at entrance 7:05 p.m. T/C from K. Dolk all testers are in county **11-2-04** 7:15 Polls open at 7:10 9:40 T/C from K Dolk "going well; no problems" 11:40 T/C from K. Dolk "going well" one DRE scrolls faster than the other on the Chinese language choice" English and Spanish scripts are executed in 4 minutes; Chinese takes 6 minutes 2:29 T/C from K Dolk "going well; no problems" 5:05 T/C from K. Dolk noticed that the clocks on both DREs are 1 hour behind (still on daylight savings time) 5:45 T/C from K Dolk "going well; no problems". Discussed closing activity 8:55 Leaving County -- will pick up materials in the morning	7:10	**9:40** **11:40** **2:29** **5:45**	**8:00** **Leave County** **8:55**

Appendix T **-** November 2, 2004 Parallel Monitoring Program Interaction with Testers *(Continued)*

Merced	**Stephanie Golka** Linda Van Dyke Steve Kawano Larry Gennette	[redacted]	**11-1-04** 6:50 pm T/C from S. Golka all testers in county **11-2-04** 6:30 a.m. T/C S. Golka Conference room not open—D. Brown in search of keys 6:50 No reception with S. Golka phone; change to S. Kawano. Rapid Response notified 7:30 Polls open delay due to conference room availability 8:40 T/C from S. Golka "Senate/house contests reversed" 10:15 T/C from S. Golka all is fine. No observers 11:45 T/C from S. Golka all is fine. No observers 2:32 T/C from S. Golka all is fine. No observers 5:53 Status Call "All is fine". Discussed closing activity 8:22 Closing is done. Leaving County	7:30	**10:15 11:45 2:32 5:53**	**8:00 Leave County8:22**

Appendix T **-** November 2, 2004 Parallel Monitoring Program Interaction with Testers *(Continued)*

Napa	Chuck Moore Michael Karnadi Dana Stinson Roy Allmond	[redacted]	**11-1-04** D. Stinson issue re: stolen SOS badge 7:30 pm T/C to C. Moore all testers in county **11-2-04** Not allowed into county until 6:45. Approved by MW to begin at 6:45 7:39 Polls open 7:48 Poor reception w/ Moore phone; change to M. Karnadi. Rapid Response notified 9:50 T/C from C. Moore all is well. One anomaly, sometimes the testers must "tap" multiple times to get the DRE to record the vote selection (Calibration issue?). Does not appear to be contest/candidate specific 12:14 T/C from C. Moore all is well 2:25 T/C from C. Moore all is well 6:50 T/C from C. Moore all is well. Napa Reporter as observer. Note to Press office. Discussed closing activity 8:55 Leaving the County	7:39	**9:50 12:14 2:25 6:50**	**8:00 Leave County 8:55**

Appendix T **-** November 2, 2004 Parallel Monitoring Program Interaction with Testers *(Continued)*

Orange	**David Hahn** Vince Hoban Denise Castellano Cynthia Willis Judy Willis	[redacted]	**11-1-04** Problem with hotel reservation. Discussed with hotel and resolved. D. Hahn checked in 7:15 pm all testers in county **11-2-04** 7:07 Polls Opened at 7:00 8:47 Tagalog is not an option. Instruct to vote as English and complete a Discrepancy Report 8:47 T/C from DH—JBC clock is fast by 10 minutes 10:05 T/C from D. Hahn, Status update-all is fine. One observer-Ray Gonzaga from L.A. SOS office 12:00 T/C from D. Hahn "going well". Found one candidate in two races and wrote a discrepancy report. 2:33 T/C from D. Hahn "going well" 6:02 T/C from D. Hahn "going well". Requests the SOS write a letter to County thanking County for all Grady Howe has done to make the day more comfortable for the testers. Discussed closing activity. 8:43 T/C D. Hahn –team leaving the county	7:00	**10:05** **12:00** **2:33** **6:02**	**8:00** **Leave County 8:43**

Appendix T **-** November 2, 2004 Parallel Monitoring Program Interaction with Testers *(Continued)*

Plumas	**Jack Falk** Janice White Lynda Allen Marcia Moreno	[redacted]	**11-1-04** 7:25 pm J. Falk checked in—all testers in county **11-2-04** 7:02 Polls Open at 7:00 10:20 Status call to J. Falk. "It's going slow—forgot to call in" 10:33 T/C from J. Falk. One team got confused and only voted the measures and no candidates on 19 scripts. Scripts have been documented and discrepancy reports completed 12:20 T/C from J. Falk "Testing going fine" 2:20 T/C from J. Falk "Testing going fine" 5:58 T/C from J. Falk "Testing going fine". Discussed closing activity 7:40 T/C from J. Falk with information on observer. Note to Press office. 9:15 Leaving county	7:00	**10:33** **12:20** **2:20** **5:58**	**8:00** **Leave County** **9:15**

Appendix T - November 2, 2004 Parallel Monitoring Program Interaction with Testers *(Continued)*

Riverside	Nick Wolf Adam Watts Paul Roberts Nancy Rembulat	[redacted]	**11-1-04** 6:05 p.m. T/C from N. Wolf "Riverside wants copy of memory card before testers leave". MW authorizes. All testers in county **11-2-04** 7:00 Polls open 7:35 T/C from NW Review screen does not allow confirmation of measures, only candidates. Issue has occurred only when Spanish is chosen; English allows confirmation of all 9:15 T/C to "Interaction with C. Stringer is fine; she stayed until we started voting" 10:00 T/C from N. Wolf All is fine. Clarification on preparing discrepancy reports 12:05 T/C from N. Wolf All is fine 3:15 Status report. All is fine 6:01 Status report. All is fine. Discussed closing activity. ROV will make card duplicate. 7:45 T/C from N. Wolf requesting clarification on executing tests 99 and 101 8:15 T/C from N. Wolf re: no totals are showing on screen. Push the results to file, remove memory cards and secure, County will put new memory cards in and create new cards. Initial memory cards will be brought here and printed out using MS Notepad 9:55 Leaving county	7:00	**10:00 12:05 3:15 6:01**	**8:00 Leave County 9:55**

Appendix T - November 2, 2004 Parallel Monitoring Program Interaction with Testers *(Continued)*

San Bernardino	Gail Estrella Tom Neal Chin May Wong Justin Wilhelm	[redacted]	**11-1-04** G. Estrella checked in 6:18 pm **11-2-04** 7:08 Polls open at 7:05—video operators were 10 minutes late 9:02 T/C from GE re: Clarification on testing time blocks 10:02 T/C from G. Estrella "all is fine"-- one county employee has been in to observe 12:32 Status Call All is fine 2:42 Status Call All is fine 6:02 Everything is going fine. Discussed closing activity 9:37 Leaving County	7:05	**10:02 12:32 2:42 6:02**	**8:00 Leave County 9:37**
Santa Clara	**Marini Ballard** Janel Prince Blaine Lamb Miguel Castillo	[redacted]	**11-1-04** M. Ballard checked in 7:40 pm **11-2-04** 7:14 Polls opened at 7:00 10:17 T/C from M. Ballard all is going well—a lot more entries then in March. There have been observers—the testers will be on the San Jose local NBC affiliate 10 pm news 11:30 T/C from M. Ballard "Vietnamese language translation is different from the SOS voter's guide." Operate on assumption that yes is always first 12:30 Status Call "All is fine" 3:05 Status Call "All is fine" Local TV station as observer--Press office notified. Discussed closing activity 6:04 Status Call "All is fine". (Left message) 8:55 Leaving the County	7:00	**10:17 12:30 3:05 6:04**	**8:00 Leave County 8:55**

Appendix T - November 2, 2004 Parallel Monitoring Program Interaction with Testers *(Continued)*

Shasta	**Nicholas Wozniak** Debbie Knight Don Tresca Jason Fanner	[redacted]	**11-1-04** N. Wozniak checked in 7:00 pm all testers in county. **11-2-04** 7:00 Polls open 10:20 Status Call "all is going well". No observers. 1:20 Status Call "Everything is going well' No Observers 3:33 Status Call "Everything is good" 6:20 Status Call "Everything is good" Discussed closing activity 8:40 T/C from N. Wozniak secured voter cards in with activator 9:20 Leaving County	7:00	**10:20** **1:20** **3:33** **6:20**	**8:00** **Leave County 9:20**
Tehama	**Mark Havener** Thomas Winslow Rolando Torres Stephanie Hamashin	[redacted]	**11-1-04** M. Havener checked in 6:55 pm all testers are in county **11-2-04** 7:04 Polls Open at 7:00 10:30 Status call "going fine—a bit slow" 12:20 Status call "going fine-begin to pick up speed as we get used to it" 3:35 Status Call "Testing going well' No Observers. 6:25 Status Call "Testing going well' Discussed closing activity 8:20 T/C from M. Havenor re: clarification on closing 9:30 Leaving County	7:00	**10:30** **12:20** **3:35** **6:25**	**8:00** **Leave County 9:30**

Appendix U
Discrepancy Reporting

Parallel Monitoring Program
November 2, 2004
Discrepancy Reporting Instructions and Forms

The team will complete a Discrepancy Report form for each deviation from the test script and/or test process and for any issues related to equipment malfunction that arise during the testing. Each Discrepancy Report must be reviewed and signed by the Team Leader and logged on the Discrepancy Log form. Discrepancy Reports will be numbered sequentially (starting with "1"). Discrepancy Reports and Discrepancy Logs are to remain in the Team Lead Testing binder at all times and will be returned to the office of the Secretary of State.

Guidelines for Calling the Secretary of State Contacts

Certain circumstances may require that you contact the designated Secretary of State contacts in addition to completing the Discrepancy Report form. Listed below are guidelines to be used to determine when it is necessary to call your contact. If you are ever in doubt about whether or not to call, ***please error on the side of caution and call*.**

Your contact names and numbers are listed below:

Primary: Jocelyn Whitney (916) 654-0298 or (916) 501-5588
Secondary: Michael Wagaman (916) 653-5534 or (916) 203-8514

The guideline to be applied when determining if you should call your contact immediately is if the test team encounters an issue that has delayed or halted testing **or** will impact expected results. The call should be made after the issue has been documented on the Discrepancy Report and logged on the Discrepancy Log.

Examples of issues that would require the completion of a Discrepancy Report and would trigger a call to the Secretary of State are:

- The team experiences hardware malfunctions and testing cannot continue; county representatives need to be called to assess if repairs can be done
- The video camera has malfunctioned
- A power outage, or other electrical problem, has halted tested (perhaps temporarily)
- A situation arises (other than an emergency) that requires contacting a county representative

Examples of issues that would require the completion of a Discrepancy Report but would **NOT** trigger a call to the Secretary of State are:

- The tester deviated from the test script and skipped a contest but made a correction prior to casting the vote
- The video recorder malfunctioned, was then repaired and all testing activity has been recorded

Parallel Monitoring Program
November 2, 2004
Discrepancy Report
Report No:

County: _____ County Team Lead: _____

Testers involved: _____ _____
Print Name Print Name

Vendor: _____ DRE Serial Number: _____ Firmware: _____

1. Record the test number the team was performing. Test No: _____
2. Record the time the discrepancy occurred: Time: _____
3. Provide a detailed description of the issue below. _____

_____
_____
_____
_____

4. Has this issue delayed or halted testing **or** will it impact expected results?

   Yes_____ NO_____ If yes, please call the SOS contact and document the following.

   Name of SOS Contact: _____ Time of Call: _____

5. Summarize the discussion and resolution below:

_____
_____
_____

6. Does this issue require further action by SOS Office?

   Yes_____ No_____ If yes, describe the action required below.

_____
_____

7. Ask the County Team Leader to review and, if the Team Leader approves the documentation above, sign off on this Report. Once the report has been signed, the team Leader will record the appropriate information in the Discrepancy Log.
8. Report Completed by: _____ _____
   Print Name Signature
9. **Report Reviewed and Approved by County Team Leader:**

_____ _____
Print Name Signature

Parallel Monitoring Program
November 2, 2004
Discrepancy Log

County: _____ Vendor: _____ DRE Serial Number: _____Firmware: _____

Team Lead: _____ Other Team Members: _____

Report No.	Brief Description of Issue/Resolution	Test Number	Tester/Observer	Time of Discrepancy	County Team Lead Signature
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					

Report No.	Brief Description of Issue/Resolution	Test Number	Tester/Observer	Time of Discrepancy	County Team Lead Signature
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					
16.					
17.					

Report No.	Brief Description of Issue/Resolution	Test Number	Tester/Observer	Time of Discrepancy	County Team Lead Signature
18.					
19.					
20.					
21.					
22.					
23.					
24.					
25.					
26.					
27.					
28.					

Appendix V
Videotape Index

County	Serial # of DRE Unit	Script #	Video Operator	Start Time	End Time
Alameda	109781	1-21	Denton/Lawrence	0655	0856
Alameda	109781	22-34	Denton/Lawrence	0930	1130
Alameda	109781	35-52	Denton/Lawrence	1145	1345
Alameda	109781	53-66	Denton/Lawrence	1345	1545
Alameda	109781	67-79	Denton/Lawrence	1545	1746
Alameda	109781	80-98	Denton/Lawrence	1747	1944
Alameda	109781	99-101	Denton/Lawrence	1945	None noted
Alameda	109877	1-21	Denton/Lawrence	0712	0905
Alameda	109877	22-34	Denton/Lawrence	0930	1130
Alameda	109877	35-52	Denton/Lawrence	1145	1345
Alameda	109877	53-66	Denton/Lawrence	1345	1545
Alameda	109877	67-79	Denton/Lawrence	1545	1746
Alameda	109877	80-98	Denton/Lawrence	1747	1944
Alameda	109877	98-101	Denton/Lawrence	1945	None noted
Merced	867747	1-20	Park	0705	0910
Merced	867747	20-34	Park	0911	1111
Merced	867747	35-52	Park	1111	1311
Merced	867747	53-66	Park	1311	1512
Merced	867747	67-77	Park	1513	1712
Merced	867747	77-91	Park	1713	1913
Merced	867747	91-101	Park	1916	2000
Merced	859604	1-20	Rotondo	0705	0910
Merced	859604	20-34	Rotondo	0911	1110
Merced	859604	35-52	Rotondo	1111	1311
Merced	859604	53-66	Rotondo	1311	1512
Merced	859604	67-77	Rotondo	1513	1712
Merced	859604	77-91	Rotondo	1713	1913
Merced	859604	91-101	Rotondo	1916	2000
Napa	19992	1-10	Brian Kendall	0700	0856
Napa	19992	11-23	Brian Kendall	0856	1055
Napa	19992	24-38	Brian Kendall	1056	1255
Napa	19992	39-52	Brian Kendall	1255	1444
Napa	19992	53-73	Brian Kendall	1445	1647
Napa	19992	74-85	Brian Kendall	1649	1843
Napa	19992	86-101	Brian Kendall	1844	2029
Napa	19995	1-15	Seth Binnix	0700	0854
Napa	19995	16-25	Seth Binnix	0854	0945

County	Serial # of DRE Unit	Script #	Video Operator	Start Time	End Time
Napa	19995	25-36	Seth Binnix	0947	1150
Napa	19995	37-52	Seth Binnix	1151	1339
Napa	19995	53-66	Seth Binnix	1339	1530
Napa	19995	67-79	Seth Binnix	1531	1720
Napa	19995	80-85	Seth Binnix	1721	1844
Napa	19995	86-101	Seth Binnix	1845	2029
Orange	A02FE8	1-14	Trey/Troy	0700	0830
Orange	A02FE8	15-27	Trey/Troy	0830	1030
Orange	A02FE8	28-44	Trey/Troy	1030	1230
Orange	A02FE8	45-60	Trey/Troy	1230	1430
Orange	A02FE8	61-73	Trey/Troy	1430	1630
Orange	A02FE8	74-85	Trey/Troy	1630	1830
Orange	A02FE8	86-101	Trey/Troy	1830	2030
Orange	COOD62 (JBC)	1	Trey/Troy	0630	0830
Orange	COOD62 (JBC)	2	Trey/Troy	0830	1030
Orange	COOD62 (JBC)	3	Trey/Troy	1030	1230
Orange	COOD62 (JBC)	4	Trey/Troy	1230	1430
Orange	COOD62 (JBC)	5	Trey/Troy	1430	1630
Orange	COOD62 (JBC)	6	Trey/Troy	1630	1830
Orange	COOD62 (JBC)	7	Trey/Troy	1830	2030
Orange	AO3E2B	1-15	Trey/Troy	0700	0830
Orange	AO3E2B	16-27	Trey/Troy	0830	1030
Orange	AO3E2B	28-43	Trey/Troy	1030	1230
Orange	AO3E2B	44-60	Trey/Troy	1230	1430
Orange	AO3E2B	61-73	Trey/Troy	1430	1630
Orange	AO3E2B	74-85	Trey/Troy	1630	1830
Orange	AO3E2B	86-101	Trey/Troy	1830	2030
Plumas	100686	1-10	Nick Pavlosky	0617	0814
Plumas	100686	11-27	Nick Pavlosky	0814	1012
Plumas	100686	28-38	Nick Pavlosky	1013	1210
Plumas	100686	39-55	Nick Pavlosky	1210	1408
Plumas	100686	56-68	Nick Pavlosky	1409	1606
Plumas	100686	69-85	Nick Pavlosky	1606	1810
Plumas	100686	86-101	Nick Pavlosky	1810	1956
Plumas	100551	1-11	Simrak	615	0815
Plumas	100551	12-27	Simrak	0814	1012
Plumas	100551	28-39	Simrak	1012	1210
Plumas	100551	40-55	Simrak	1210	1410
Plumas	100551	56-69	Simrak	1410	1605
Plumas	100551	70-85	Simrak	1605	1810

County	Serial # of DRE Unit	Script #	Video Operator	Start Time	End Time
Plumas	100551	86-101	Simrak	1810	1956
Plumas	100551	Close Out	Simrak		
Riverside	Set-up for units 1722 & 4550		Mike Gallagher		
Riverside	1722	1-15	Mike Gallagher	0646	0840
Riverside	1722	16-27	Mike Gallagher	0840	1030
Riverside	1722	28-40	Mike Gallagher	1030	1230
Riverside	1722	41-60	Mike Gallagher	1230	1430
Riverside	1722	61-73	Mike Gallagher	1430	1630
Riverside	1722	74-85	Mike Gallagher	1630	1836
Riverside	1722	86-101	Mike Gallagher	1836	2125
Riverside	4550	1-19	Nick Dustin	0646	0840
Riverside	4550	20-27	Nick Dustin	0840	1030
Riverside	4550	28-41	Nick Dustin	1030	1230
Riverside	4550	42-60	Nick Dustin	1230	1430
Riverside	4550	61-73	Nick Dustin	1430	1630
Riverside	4550	74-85	Nick Dustin	1630	1835
Riverside	4550	86-101	Nick Dustin	1835	2125
San Bernardino	29623	1-21	Dean Tapia	0650	0848
San Bernardino	29623	22-32	Dean Tapia	0848	1048
San Bernardino	29623	32-46	Dean Tapia	1049	1248
San Bernardino	29623	47-60	Dean Tapia	1349	1445
San Bernardino	29623	61-73 & 86	Dean Tapia	1446	1650
San Bernardino	29623	74-85	Dean Tapia	1650	1846
San Bernardino	29623	87-101	Dean Tapia	1846	2050
San Bernardino	29623	Close Out	Dean Tapia	2050	2137
San Bernardino	30452	1-12	Mike Sanchez	0650	0845
San Bernardino	30452	13-29	Mike Sanchez	0846	1043
San Bernardino	30452	30-46	Mike Sanchez	1044	1242
San Bernardino	30452	47-60	Mike Sanchez	1243	1442
San Bernardino	30452	61-73	Mike Sanchez	1443	1643
San Bernardino	30452	74-85	Mike Sanchez	1643	1843
San Bernardino	30452	86-101	Mike Sanchez	1844	2048
San Bernardino	30452	Close Out	Mike Sanchez	2049	2145
Santa Clara	25260	1-27	Mike Kuehner	0623	1059
Santa Clara	25260	28-41.5	Mike Kuehner	1100	1300
Santa Clara	25260	41.5-66	Mike Kuehner	1307	1511
Santa Clara	25260	66-76	Mike Kuehner	1511	1716
Santa Clara	25260	76-96	Mike Kuehner	1716	1921

County	Serial # of DRE Unit	Script #	Video Operator	Start Time	End Time
Santa Clara	25260	97- ?	Mike Kuehner	1921	2040
Santa Clara	25256	1-27	Bob Allen	6:23	1059
Santa Clara	25256	30-41.5	Bob Allen	1100	1300
Santa Clara	25256	41.5-66	Bob Allen	1307	1511
Santa Clara	25256	67-78	Bob Allen	1511	1716
Santa Clara	25256	79-101	Bob Allen	1716	1921
Santa Clara	25256	None Noted	Bob Allen	1921	2040
Shasta	19842	1-6	Andy Cauble	0610	0756
Shasta	19842	7-23	Andy Cauble	0758	0945
Shasta	19842	24-34	Andy Cauble	0947	1139
Shasta	19842	35-52	Andy Cauble	1140	1320
Shasta	19842	53-66	Andy Cauble	1320	1515
Shasta	19842	67-75	Andy Cauble	1517	1709
Shasta	19842	76-89	Andy Cauble	1709	1903
Shasta	19842	90-101	Andy Cauble	1904	2023
Shasta	19844	1-7	Andy Cauble	0610	0756
Shasta	19844	8-24	Andy Cauble	0758	0945
Shasta	19844	25-34	Andy Cauble	0947	1139
Shasta	19844	35-52	Andy Cauble	1140	1320
Shasta	19844	53-66	Andy Cauble	1320	1515
Shasta	19844	67-75	Andy Cauble	1517	1709
Shasta	19844	76-89	Andy Cauble	1709	1903
Shasta	19844	90-101	Andy Cauble	1904	None noted
Tehama	21850	1-14	Bob Knaggs	0642	0830
Tehama	21850	15-27	Bob Knaggs	0835	1027
Tehama	21850	28-43	Bob Knaggs	1030	1233
Tehama	21850	44-66	Bob Knaggs	1234	1530
Tehama	21850	67-85	Bob Knaggs	1533	1830
Tehama	21850	86-100	Bob Knaggs	1830	2100
Tehama	21846	1-10	Don Havener	0642	0829
Tehama	21846	11-27	Don Havener	0835	1027
Tehama	21846	28-39	Don Havener	1030	1233
Tehama	21846	40-66	Don Havener	1234	1530
Tehama	21846	67-85	Don Havener	1533	1830
Tehama	21846	86-101	Don Havener	1830	2100

Appendix W

Test Artifact Inventory Checklist Form
Parallel Monitoring Program
November 2, 2004
Test Artifacts Inventory Checklist

Complete and sign this checklist for each DRE and ensure that all test artifacts are inventoried, secured and returned to the SOS. Add to the list below, if necessary.

County: _____ **DRE unit serial number:** _____

No.	Item	Verified
Lead Tester Binder with:		
1	Completed and signed Equipment Security and Chain of Custody Forms: • Pre Test Equipment Security Verification • Post Test Equipment Security Documentation • Items Retained by the Secretary of State	
2	Executed Test Scripts	
3	Completed and signed Discrepancy Reports	
4	Completed and signed Discrepancy Log	
SOS "Retained Test Artifacts" Pouch with:		
5	DRE "Zero" report	
6	DRE "Tally" report	
7	Voter Access Card(s) -- Note quantity here	
8	Supervisor Access Card(s) -- Note quantity here _____	
8	Memory card (labeled)	
	Record SOS Pouch security seal number here	
Other items:		
9	Parallel Monitoring ID badges from Team Members	
10	Video recorded tapes (each must be labeled with county name, time covered, and equipment serial number of DRE).	
11	Completed and signed Test Artifacts Inventory Checklist	
12	Completed and signed Activity Checklist form	

Time verification is complete: _____

Team Member completing inventory checklist:

_____ _____
Print Sign

Reviewed by Team Member:

_____ _____
Print Sign

Approved by Team Lead:

_____ _____
Print Sign

Appendix X

Baseline Expected Tally vs. Actual Tally
Alameda County

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Alameda	1	President	David Cobb for President	3	3	0				0
Alameda	1	President	George W. Bush for President	18	18	0				0
Alameda	1	President	John F. Kerry for President	68	68	0				0
Alameda	1	President	Leonard Peltier for President	1	1	0				0
Alameda	1	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	3	3	0				0
Alameda	1	President	Michael Badnarik for President	5	5	0				0
Alameda	1	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Alameda	1	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	65	65	0				0
Alameda	1	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	18	18	0				0
Alameda	1	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	2	2	0				0
Alameda	1	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	5	5	0				0
Alameda	1	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	1	1	0				0
Alameda	1	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Alameda	1	U.S. House	Barbara Lee	67	67	0				0
Alameda	1	U.S. House	Claudia Bermudez	22	22	0				0
Alameda	1	U.S. House	Jim Eyer	1	1	0				0
Alameda	1	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Alameda	1	State Senate	Don Perata	58	58	0				0
Alameda	1	State Senate	Patricia Deutsche	29	29	0				0
Alameda	1	State Senate	Peter Von Pinnon	2	2	0				0
Alameda	1	State Senate	Tom Condit	1	1	0				0
Alameda	1	State Senate	Write-In State Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Alameda	1	State Assembly	Jerald Udinsky	27	27	0				0
Alameda	1	State Assembly	Wilma Chan	61	61	0				0
Alameda	1	State Assembly	Write-In State Assembly Candidate	1	1	0				0
Alameda	1	School Board	Cy Gulassa	46	46	0				0
Alameda	1	School Board	Melanie Sweeney-Griffith	53	53	0				0
Alameda	1	District:BART	Bob Franklin	33	33	0				0
Alameda	1	District:BART	Kathy Neal	34	34	0				0
Alameda	1	District:BART	Roy Nakadegawa	32	32	0				0
Alameda	1	District Director	H.E. Christian (Chris) Peeples	42	42	0				0
Alameda	1	District Director	James Karim Muhammad	29	29	0				0
Alameda	1	District Director	Rebecca Rae Oliver	28	28	0				0
Alameda	1	District Director Ward 2	Christine A. Zook	46	46	0				0
Alameda	1	District Director Ward 2	Greg Harper	53	53	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	45	45	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	53	53	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	39	39	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	59	59	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	53	53	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	44	44	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	57	57	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. -	39	39	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
			Vote YES							
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	60	60	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	35	35	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	34	34	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	50	50	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	61	61	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	39	39	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	53	53	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	59	59	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	38	38	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	51	51	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	52	52	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	36	36	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	33	33	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	53	53	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	28	28	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	42	42	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	41	41	0				0
Alameda	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	43	43	0				0
Alameda	1	District: S.F. BART Measure AA	San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Measure AA- Vote No	52	52	0				0
Alameda	1	District: S.F. BART Measure AA	San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Measure AA- Vote Yes	47	47	0				0
Alameda	1	City-Measure	City of Oakland Measure Y - Vote No	36	36	0				0
Alameda	1	City-Measure	City of Oakland Measure Y - Vote Yes	63	63	0				0
Alameda	1	City-Measure	City of Oakland Measure Z - Vote No	53	53	0				0
Alameda	1	City-Measure	City of Oakland Measure Z - Vote Yes	46	46	0				0
Alameda	1	Local Measures	AC Transit Special District 1 Measure BB - Vote No	51	51	0				0
Alameda	1	Local Measures	AC Transit Special District 1 Measure BB - Vote Yes	48	48	0				0
Alameda	1	Local Measures	East Bay Regional Park District - Zone 1 Measure CC - Vote NO	53	53	0				0
Alameda	1	Local Measures	East Bay Regional Park District - Zone 1 Measure CC - Vote YES	46	46	0				0
Alameda	2	President	David Cobb for President	3	3	0				0
Alameda	2	President	George W. Bush for President	18	18	0				0
Alameda	2	President	John F. Kerry for President	68	68	0				0
Alameda	2	President	Leonard Peltier for President	1	1	0				0
Alameda	2	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	3	3	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Alameda	2	President	Michael Badnarik for President	5	5	0				0
Alameda	2	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Alameda	2	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	65	65	0				0
Alameda	2	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	18	18	0				0
Alameda	2	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	2	2	0				0
Alameda	2	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	5	5	0				0
Alameda	2	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	1	1	0				0
Alameda	2	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Alameda	2	U.S. House	Barbara Lee	67	67	0				0
Alameda	2	U.S. House	Claudia Bermudez	22	22	0				0
Alameda	2	U.S. House	Jim Eyer	1	1	0				0
Alameda	2	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Alameda	2	State Senate	Don Perata	58	58	0				0
Alameda	2	State Senate	Patricia Deutsche	29	29	0				0
Alameda	2	State Senate	Peter Von Pinnon	2	2	0				0
Alameda	2	State Senate	Tom Condit	1	1	0				0
Alameda	2	State Senate	Write-In State Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Alameda	2	State Assembly	Jerald Udinsky	27	27	0				0
Alameda	2	State Assembly	Wilma Chan	61	61	0				0
Alameda	2	State Assembly	Write-In State Assembly Candidate	1	1	0				0
Alameda	2	School Board	Cy Gulassa	46	46	0				0
Alameda	2	School Board	Melanie Sweeney-Griffith	53	53	0				0
Alameda	2	District:BART	Bob Franklin	33	33	0				0
Alameda	2	District:BART	Kathy Neal	34	34	0				0
Alameda	2	District:BART	Roy Nakadegawa	32	32	0				0
Alameda	2	District Director	H.E. Christian (Chris) Peeples	42	42	0				0
Alameda	2	District Director	James Karim Muhammad	29	29	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Alameda	2	District Director	Rebecca Rae Oliver	28	28	0				0
Alameda	2	District Director Ward 2	Christine A. Zook	46	46	0				0
Alameda	2	District Director Ward 2	Greg Harper	53	53	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	45	45	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	53	53	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	39	39	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	59	59	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	53	53	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	44	44	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	57	57	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	39	39	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	60	60	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	35	35	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	34	34	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	50	50	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	61	61	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	39	39	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	53	53	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	59	59	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	38	38	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	51	51	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	52	52	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	36	36	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	33	33	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	53	53	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	28	28	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	42	42	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	41	41	0				0
Alameda	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	43	43	0				0
Alameda	2	District: S.F. BART Measure AA	San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Measure AA- Vote No	52	52	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Alameda	2	District: S.F. BART Measure AA	San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Measure AA- Vote Yes	47	47	0				0
Alameda	2	City-Measure	City of Oakland Measure Y - Vote No	36	36	0				0
Alameda	2	City-Measure	City of Oakland Measure Y - Vote Yes	63	63	0				0
Alameda	2	City-Measure	City of Oakland Measure Z - Vote No	53	53	0				0
Alameda	2	City-Measure	City of Oakland Measure Z - Vote Yes	46	46	0				0
Alameda	2	Local Measures	AC Transit Special District 1 Measure BB - Vote No	51	51	0				0
Alameda	2	Local Measures	AC Transit Special District 1 Measure BB - Vote Yes	48	48	0				0
Alameda	2	Local Measures	East Bay Regional Park District - Zone 1 Measure CC - Vote NO	53	53	0				0
Alameda	2	Local Measures	East Bay Regional Park District - Zone 1 Measure CC - Vote YES	46	46	0				0

Merced County

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Merced	1	President	George W. Bush for President	58	58	0				0
Merced	1	President	John F. Kerry for President	37	37	0				0
Merced	1	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Merced	1	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	45	45	0				0
Merced	1	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	49	49	0				0
Merced	1	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Merced	1	U.S. House	Charles F. Pringle	50	50	0				0
Merced	1	U.S. House	Dennis A. Cardoza	42	42	0				0
Merced	1	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Merced	1	State Assembly	Barbara S. Matthews	36	36	0				0
Merced	1	State Assembly	Nellie McGarry	53	53	0				0
Merced	1	State Assembly	Write-In State Assembly	1	1	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	25	25	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	73	73	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	29	29	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	69	69	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	44	44	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	34	34	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	63	63	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	38	38	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	28	28	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	67	67	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	31	31	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	53	53	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	27	27	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	66	66	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	62	62	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	30	30	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	15	15	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	76	76	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	25	25	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	64	64	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	25	25	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	63	63	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	18	18	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	68	68	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	54	54	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	29	29	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	56	56	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	22	22	0				0
Merced	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	62	62	0				0
Merced	2	President	George W. Bush for President	58	57	1	19	57	57	0
Merced	2	President	John F. Kerry for President	37	37	0				0
Merced	2	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka	0	1	1	19	1	1	0
Merced	2	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Merced	2	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	45	45	0				0
Merced	2	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	49	49	0				0
Merced	2	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Merced	2	U.S. House	Charles F. Pringle	50	50	0				0
Merced	2	U.S. House	Dennis A. Cardoza	42	42	0				0
Merced	2	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Merced	2	State	Barbara S. Matthews	36	36	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
		Assembly								
Merced	2	State Assembly	Nellie McGarry	53	53	0				0
Merced	2	State Assembly	Write-In State Assembly	1	1	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	25	25	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	73	73	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	29	29	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	69	69	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	44	44	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	34	34	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	63	63	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	38	38	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	28	28	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	67	67	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	31	31	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	53	53	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	27	27	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	66	66	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	62	62	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	30	30	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	15	15	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	76	76	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	25	24	1	18	24	24	0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	64	65	1	18	65	65	0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	25	26	1	17	26	26	0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	63	62	1	17	62	62	0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	18	18	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	68	68	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	54	54	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log#*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	29	29	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	56	56	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	22	22	0				0
Merced	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	62	62	0				0

Napa County

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Napa	1	President	David Cobb for President	1	1	0				0
Napa	1	President	George W. Bush for President	41	41	0				0
Napa	1	President	John F. Kerry for President	49	49	0				0
Napa	1	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	3	3	0				0
Napa	1	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0
Napa	1	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Napa	1	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	42	42	0				0
Napa	1	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	36	36	0				0
Napa	1	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	14	14	0				0
Napa	1	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	2	2	0				0
Napa	1	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Napa	1	U.S. House	Lawrence R. Wiesner	39	39	0				0
Napa	1	U.S. House	Mike Thompson	52	52	0				0
Napa	1	U.S. House	Pamela Elizondo	1	1	0				0
Napa	1	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Napa	1	State Assembly	F. Aaron Smith	2	2	0				0
Napa	1	State Assembly	Noreen Evans	46	46	0				0
Napa	1	State Assembly	Pat Krueger	41	41	0				0
Napa	1	State Assembly	Write-In State Assembly Candidate	1	1	0				0
Napa	1	School Board	D. Michael Jack	33	33	0				0
Napa	1	School Board	Jose Hurtado	32	32	0				0
Napa	1	School Board	Raymond Beaty	34	34	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	35	35	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	63	63	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	62	62	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	36	36	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	50	50	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	49	49	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	75	75	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	21	21	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	61	61	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	34	34	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	71	71	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	13	13	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	61	61	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	46	46	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	46	46	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	88	88	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	3	3	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	58	58	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	31	31	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	45	45	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	43	43	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	56	56	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	30	30	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	58	58	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	27	27	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	30	30	0				0
Napa	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	54	54	0				0
Napa	1	Local Measures	Prop T - County Dining Zoning District - Vote NO	51	51	0				0
Napa	1	Local Measures	Prop T - County Dining Zoning District - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
Napa	1	Local Measures	Prop V - Transient Occupancy Tax - Vote NO	69	69	0				0
Napa	1	Local Measures	Prop V - Transient Occupancy Tax - Vote Yes	30	30	0				0
Napa	1	Local Measures	Prop W - Jamieson Canyon Road "Advisory Vote Only" - Vote NO	65	65	0				0
Napa	1	Local Measures	Prop W - Jamieson Canyon Road "Advisory Vote Only" - Vote YES	34	34	0				0
Napa	2	President	David Cobb for President	1	1	0				0
Napa	2	President	George W. Bush for President	41	41	0				0
Napa	2	President	John F. Kerry for President	49	49	0				0
Napa	2	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	3	3	0				0
Napa	2	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0
Napa	2	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Napa	2	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	42	42	0				0
Napa	2	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	36	36	0				0
Napa	2	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	14	14	0				0
Napa	2	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	2	2	0				0
Napa	2	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Napa	2	U.S. House	Lawrence R. Wiesner	39	39	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Napa	2	U.S. House	Mike Thompson	52	52	0				0
Napa	2	U.S. House	Pamela Elizondo	1	1	0				0
Napa	2	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Napa	2	State Assembly	F. Aaron Smith	2	2	0				0
Napa	2	State Assembly	Noreen Evans	46	46	0				0
Napa	2	State Assembly	Pat Krueger	41	41	0				0
Napa	2	State Assembly	Write-In State Assembly Candidate	1	1	0				0
Napa	2	School Board	D. Michael Jack	33	33	0				0
Napa	2	School Board	Jose Hurtado	32	32	0				0
Napa	2	School Board	Raymond Beaty	34	34	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	35	35	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	63	63	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	62	62	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	36	36	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	50	50	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	49	49	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	75	75	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	21	21	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	61	61	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	34	34	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	71	71	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	13	13	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	61	61	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	46	46	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	46	46	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	88	88	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	3	3	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	58	58	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	31	31	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	45	45	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	43	43	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	56	56	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	30	30	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	58	58	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	27	27	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	30	30	0				0
Napa	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	54	54	0				0
Napa	2	Local Measures	Prop T - County Dining Zoning District - Vote NO	51	51	0				0
Napa	2	Local Measures	Prop T - County Dining Zoning District - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
Napa	2	Local Measures	Prop V - Transient Occupancy Tax - Vote NO	69	69	0				0
Napa	2	Local Measures	Prop V - Transient Occupancy Tax - Vote Yes	30	30	0				0
Napa	2	Local Measures	Prop W - Jamieson Canyon Road "Advisory Vote Only" - Vote NO	65	65	0				0
Napa	2	Local Measures	Prop W - Jamieson Canyon Road "Advisory Vote Only" - Vote YES	34	34	0				0

Orange County

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Orange	1	President	David Cobb for President	1	1	0				0
Orange	1	President	George W. Bush for President	68	68	0				0
Orange	1	President	John F. Kerry for President	21	21	0				0
Orange	1	President	Leonard Peltier for President	1	1	0				
Orange	1	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	3	3	0				0
Orange	1	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0
Orange	1	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Orange	1	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	18	18	0				0
Orange	1	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	56	56	0				0
Orange	1	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	10	10	0				0
Orange	1	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	7	7	0				0
Orange	1	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	3	3	0				0
Orange	1	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Orange	1	U.S. House	Gary G. Miller	61	62	1	15	62	62	0
Orange	1	U.S. House	Lewis Meyers	30	30	0				0
Orange	1	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Orange	1	State Senate	Dick Ackerman	58	58	0				0
Orange	1	State Senate	Randall Daugherty	32	32	0				0
Orange	1	State Senate	Write-In Stare Senate Candidate	1	1	0				0
Orange	1	State Assembly	Bea Foster	23	23	0				0
Orange	1	State Assembly	Todd Spitzer	65	65	0				0
Orange	1	State Assembly	Write-In State Assem. Candidate	1	1	0				0
Orange	1	School - Trustee Area 3	Gary V. Miller	42	41	1	16	41	41	0
Orange	1	School - Trustee Area 3	William (Bill) Jay	57	57	0				0
Orange	1	School - Trustee Area 7	John S. Williams	65	65	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Orange	1	School - Trustee Area 7	Kevin S. Thompson	34	34	0				0
Orange	1	City	Brad Morton	9	9	0				0
Orange	1	City	Dan Joseph	31	31	0				0
Orange	1	City	Frank Ury	8	8	0				0
Orange	1	City	Gail Reavis	51	51	0				0
Orange	1	City	Nancy Howell	2	2	0				0
Orange	1	Districts	Bill Vanderwerff	15	15	0				0
Orange	1	Districts	Ergun (Eric) Bakall	43	43	0				0
Orange	1	Districts	Jeffery M. Thomas	41	41	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	33	33	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	44	44	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	31	31	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	67	67	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	80	80	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	17	17	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	33	33	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	32	32	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	55	55	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	29	29	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	74	74	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business	19	19	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
			Competition Laws. - Vote YES							
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	11	11	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	81	81	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	26	26	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	49	49	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	61	61	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	27	27	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	39	39	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	47	47	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	21	21	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	22	22	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
Orange	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	21	21	0				0
Orange	1	Local Measures	Prop K - Transient Occupancy Tax. - Vote YES	19	19	0				0
Orange	1	Local Measures	Prop K - Transient Occupancy Tax. - Vote NO	80	80	0				0
Orange	2	President	David Cobb for President	1	1	0				0
Orange	2	President	George W. Bush for President	68	68	0				0
Orange	2	President	John F. Kerry for President	21	21	0				0
Orange	2	President	Leonard Peltier for President	1	1	0				0
Orange	2	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	3	3	0				0
Orange	2	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Orange	2	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Orange	2	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	18	18	0				0
Orange	2	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	56	56	0				0
Orange	2	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	10	10	0				0
Orange	2	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	7	7	0				0
Orange	2	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	3	3	0				0
Orange	2	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Orange	2	U.S. House	Gary G. Miller	61	61	0				0
Orange	2	U.S. House	Lewis Meyers	30	30	0				0
Orange	2	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Orange	2	State Senate	Dick Ackerman	58	58	0				0
Orange	2	State Senate	Randall Daugherty	32	32	0				0
Orange	2	State Senate	Write-In Stare Senate Candidate	1	1	0				0
Orange	2	State Assembly	Bea Foster	23	23	0				0
Orange	2	State Assembly	Todd Spitzer	65	65	0				0
Orange	2	State Assembly	Write-In State Assem. Candidate	1	1	0				0
Orange	2	School - Trustee Area 3	Gary V. Miller	42	42	0				0
Orange	2	School - Trustee Area 3	William (Bill) Jay	57	57	0				0
Orange	2	School - Trustee Area 7	John S. Williams	65	65	0				0
Orange	2	School - Trustee Area 7	Kevin S. Thompson	34	34	0				0
Orange	2	City	Brad Morton	9	9	0				0
Orange	2	City	Dan Joseph	31	31	0				0
Orange	2	City	Frank Ury	8	8	0				0
Orange	2	City	Gail Reavis	51	51	0				0
Orange	2	City	Nancy Howell	2	2	0				0
Orange	2	Districts	Bill Vanderwerff	15	15	0				0
Orange	2	Districts	Ergun (Eric) Bakall	43	43	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Orange	2	Districts	Jeffery M. Thomas	41	41	0				
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	33	33	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	44	44	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	31	31	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	67	67	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	80	80	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	17	17	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	33	33	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	32	32	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	55	55	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	29	29	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	74	74	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	19	19	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	11	11	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	81	81	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	26	26	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	49	49	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote	61	61	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
			NO							
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	27	27	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	39	39	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	47	47	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	21	21	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	22	22	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
Orange	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	21	21	0				0
Orange	2	Local Measures	Prop K - Transient Occupancy Tax. - Vote YES	19	19	0				0
Orange	2	Local Measures	Prop K - Transient Occupancy Tax. - Vote NO	80	80	0				0

Plumas County

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Plumas	1	President	David Cobb for President	1	0	1	2	0	0	0
Plumas	1	President	George W. Bush for President	40	38	2	2	38	38	0
Plumas	1	President	John F. Kerry for President	44	37	7	2	37	37	0
Plumas	1	President	Leonard Peltier for President	1	0	1	2	0	0	0
Plumas	1	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	6	0	6	2	0	0	0
Plumas	1	President	Michael Badnarik for President	6	3	3	2	3	3	0
Plumas	1	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Plumas	1	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	42	37	5	2	37	37	0
Plumas	1	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	43	40	3	2	40	40	0
Plumas	1	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	5	0	5	2	0	0	0
Plumas	1	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	3	0	3	2	0	0	0
Plumas	1	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	1	0	1	2	0	0	0
Plumas	1	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Plumas	1	U.S. House	David I. Winters	46	39	7	2	39	39	0
Plumas	1	U.S. House	John T. Doolittle	40	38	2	2	38	38	0
Plumas	1	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0	2			0
Plumas	1	State Senate	Dave Cox	42	36	6	2	36	36	0
Plumas	1	State Senate	Kristine Lang McDonald	44	41	3	2	41	41	0
Plumas	1	State Senate	Roberto Leibman	3	0	3	2	0	0	0
Plumas	1	State Senate	Write-In State Senate Candidate	1	1	0				0
Plumas	1	State Assembly	Rick Keene	39	37	2	2	37	37	0
Plumas	1	State Assembly	Robert A. Woods	47	40	7	2	40	40	0
Plumas	1	State Assembly	Robert Burk	3	0	3	2	0	0	0
Plumas	1	State Assembly	Write-In State Assembly Candidate	1	1	0				
Plumas	1	School	John Sheehan	71	62	9	2	62	62	0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Plumas	1	School	Luiz G. Gutierrez	28	17	11	2	17	17	0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	38	38	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	60	60	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	41	41	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	57	57	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	44	44	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	41	41	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	56	56	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	41	41	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	55	55	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	17	17	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiat ive. - Vote YES	78	78	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	36	36	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	1	1	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	92	92	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	38	38	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	6	6	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	85	85	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	39	39	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	50	50	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	35	35	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	51	51	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	2	2	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	84	84	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	36	36	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	49	49	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	10	10	0				0
Plumas	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	74	74	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Plumas	2	President	David Cobb for President	1	1	0				0
Plumas	2	President	George W. Bush for President	40	40	0				0
Plumas	2	President	John F. Kerry for President	44	44	0				0
Plumas	2	President	Leonard Peltier for President	1	1	0				0
Plumas	2	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	6	6	0				0
Plumas	2	President	Michael Badnarik for President	6	6	0				0
Plumas	2	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Plumas	2	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	42	42	0				0
Plumas	2	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	43	43	0				0
Plumas	2	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	5	5	0				0
Plumas	2	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	3	3	0				0
Plumas	2	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	1	1	0				0
Plumas	2	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Plumas	2	U.S. House	David I. Winters	46	46	0				0
Plumas	2	U.S. House	John T. Doolittle	40	40	0				0
Plumas	2	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Plumas	2	State Senate	Dave Cox	42	42	0				0
Plumas	2	State Senate	Kristine Lang McDonald	44	44	0				0
Plumas	2	State Senate	Roberto Leibman	3	3	0				0
Plumas	2	State Senate	Write-In State Senate Candidate	1	1	0				0
Plumas	2	State Assembly	Rick Keene	39	39	0				0
Plumas	2	State Assembly	Robert A. Woods	47	47	0				0
Plumas	2	State Assembly	Robert Burk	3	3	0				0
Plumas	2	State Assembly	Write-In State Assembly Candidate	1	1	0				0
Plumas	2	School	John Sheehan	71	71	0				0
Plumas	2	School	Luiz G. Gutierrez	28	28	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	38	38	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	60	60	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	41	41	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	57	57	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	54	53	0	14	53	53	0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	44	45	0	14	45	45	0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	41	41	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	56	56	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	41	41	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	55	55	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	17	17	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	78	78	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	36	36	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	1	1	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	92	92	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	38	38	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	6	6	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	85	85	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	39	39	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	50	50	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	35	35	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	51	51	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	2	2	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	84	84	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	36	36	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	49	49	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	10	10	0				0
Plumas	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	74	74	0				0

Riverside County

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Riverside	1	President	David Cobb for President	1	1	0				0
Riverside	1	President	George W. Bush for President	65	65	0				0
Riverside	1	President	John F. Kerry for President	26	26	0				0
Riverside	1	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	3	3	0				0
Riverside	1	President	Michael Badnarik for President	3	3	0				0
Riverside	1	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Riverside	1	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	27	27	0				0
Riverside	1	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	58	58	0				0
Riverside	1	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	9	9	0				0
Riverside	1	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Riverside	1	U.S. House	Mary Bono	52	52	0				0
Riverside	1	U.S. House	Richard J. Meyer	40	40	0				0
Riverside	1	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Riverside	1	State Senate	Jim Battin	56	56	0				0
Riverside	1	State Senate	Pat Johansen	34	34	0				0
Riverside	1	State Senate	Write-In State Senate Candidate	1	1	0				0
Riverside	1	State Assembly	Bonnie Garcia	62	62	0				0
Riverside	1	State Assembly	Mary Ann Andreas	27	27	0				0
Riverside	1	State Assembly	Write-In	1	1	0				0
Riverside	1	Judicial	Sarah Adams Christian	38	38	0				0
Riverside	1	Judicial	Shaffer T. Cormell	61	61	0				0
Riverside	1	Districts	Patricia "Corky" Larson	19	19	0				0
Riverside	1	Districts	Roy Carl Klopfenstein	80	80	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	75	75	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	23	23	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	48	48	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	50	50	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	47	47	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	50	50	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	58	58	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	38	38	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	52	52	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	56	56	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	28	28	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	42	42	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	51	51	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	72	72	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	20	20	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	49	49	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	42	42	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. -	50	50	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
			Vote NO							
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	39	39	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	38	38	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	50	50	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	44	44	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	42	42	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	28	28	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	52	52	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	33	33	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	49	49	0				0
Riverside	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	35	35	0				0
Riverside	1	School - Trustee Area 2	Charles "Chuck" Hayden	32	32	0				0
Riverside	1	School - Trustee Area 2	E. Allen Keeney	67	67	0				0
Riverside	1	School - Trustee Area 3	Annette O. Harvey	23	23	0				0
Riverside	1	School - Trustee Area 3	Merle C. "Bud" Miller	46	46	0				0
Riverside	1	School - Trustee	Sonja S. Marchand	30	30	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
		Area 3								
Riverside	1	Desert Sands School District	Carl Mc Peters	4	4	0				0
Riverside	1	Desert Sands School District	Clark Mc Cartney	11	11	0				0
Riverside	1	Desert Sands School District	Ellen C. Burr	13	13	0				0
Riverside	1	Desert Sands School District	Gary Tomak	32	32	0				0
Riverside	1	Desert Sands School District	Marie J. Santana	5	5	0				0
Riverside	1	Desert Sands School District	Matt Monica	8	8	0				0
Riverside	1	Desert Sands School District	Neil D. Lingle	15	15	0				0
Riverside	1	Desert Sands School District	Patrick Runyon	15	15	0				0
Riverside	1	City - Mayor	Don Adolph	99	99	0				0
Riverside	1	City - Council	Ken Napper	49	49	0				0
Riverside	1	City - Council	Lee M. Osborne	38	38	0				0
Riverside	1	City - Council	Robert G. Cox	6	6	0				0
Riverside	1	City - Council	Stanley Sniff	7	7	0				0
Riverside	2	President	David Cobb for President	1	1	0				0
Riverside	2	President	George W. Bush for President	65	65	0				0
Riverside	2	President	John F. Kerry for President	26	26	0				0
Riverside	2	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	3	3	0				0
Riverside	2	President	Michael Badnarik for President	3	3	0				0
Riverside	2	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Riverside	2	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	27	27	0				0
Riverside	2	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	58	58	0				0
Riverside	2	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	9	9	0				0
Riverside	2	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Riverside	2	U.S. House	Mary Bono	52	52	0				0
Riverside	2	U.S. House	Richard J. Meyer	40	40	0				0
Riverside	2	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Riverside	2	State Senate	Jim Battin	56	56	0				0
Riverside	2	State Senate	Pat Johansen	34	34	0				0
Riverside	2	State Senate	Write-In State Senate Candidate	1	1	0				0
Riverside	2	State Assembly	Bonnie Garcia	62	62	0				0
Riverside	2	State Assembly	Mary Ann Andreas	27	27	0				0
Riverside	2	State Assembly	Write-In	1	1	0				0
Riverside	2	Judicial	Sarah Adams Christian	38	38	0				0
Riverside	2	Judicial	Shaffer T. Cormell	61	61	0				0
Riverside	2	Districts	Patricia "Corky" Larson	19	19	0				0
Riverside	2	Districts	Roy Carl Klopfenstein	80	80	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	75	75	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	23	23	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	48	48	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	50	50	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	47	47	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	50	50	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	58	58	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	38	38	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	52	52	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	56	56	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	28	28	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	42	42	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	51	51	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	72	72	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	20	20	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	49	49	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	42	42	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	50	50	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	39	39	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	38	38	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	50	50	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	44	44	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	42	42	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	28	28	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	52	52	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	33	33	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	49	49	0				0
Riverside	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	35	35	0				0
Riverside	2	School - Trustee Area 2	Charles "Chuck" Hayden	32	32	0				0
Riverside	2	School - Trustee Area 2	E. Allen Keeney	67	67	0				0
Riverside	2	School - Trustee Area 3	Annette O. Harvey	23	23	0				0
Riverside	2	School - Trustee Area 3	Merle C. "Bud" Miller	46	46	0				0
Riverside	2	School - Trustee Area 3	Sonja S. Marchand	30	30	0				0
Riverside	2	Desert Sands School District	Carl Mc Peters	4	4	0				0
Riverside	2	Desert Sands School District	Clark Mc Cartney	11	11	0				0
Riverside	2	Desert Sands School District	Ellen C. Burr	13	13	0				0
Riverside	2	Desert Sands	Gary Tomak	32	32	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
		School District								
Riverside	2	Desert Sands School District	Marie J. Santana	5	5	0				0
Riverside	2	Desert Sands School District	Matt Monica	8	8	0				0
Riverside	2	Desert Sands School District	Neil D. Lingle	15	15	0				0
Riverside	2	Desert Sands School District	Patrick Runyon	15	15	0				0
Riverside	2	City - Mayor	Don Adolph	99	99	0				0
Riverside	2	City - Council	Ken Napper	49	49	0				0
Riverside	2	City - Council	Lee M. Osborne	38	38	0				0
Riverside	2	City - Council	Robert G. Cox	6	6	0				0
Riverside	2	City - Council	Stanley Sniff	7	7	0				0

San Bernardino County

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
San Bernardino	1	President	David Cobb for President	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	1	President	George W. Bush for President	41	41	0				0
San Bernardino	1	President	John F. Kerry for President	44	44	0				0
San Bernardino	1	President	Leonard Peltier for President	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	1	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	7	7	0				0
San Bernardino	1	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0
San Bernardino	1	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	1	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	22	22	0				0
San Bernardino	1	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	47	47	0				0
San Bernardino	1	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	14	14	0				0
San Bernardino	1	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	10	10	0				0
San Bernardino	1	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	1	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	1	U.S. House	Fred "Tim" Willoughby	38	38	0				0
San Bernardino	1	U.S. House	Howard P. "Buck" McKeon	50	50	0				0
San	1	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Bernardino										
San Bernardino	1	State Assembly	Bill Maze	50	50	0				0
San Bernardino	1	State Assembly	Maggie Florez	38	38	0				0
San Bernardino	1	State Assembly	Write-In	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Mayor, Barstow	Bud Campbell	42	42	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Mayor, Barstow	Carmen M. Hernandez	21	21	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Mayor, Barstow	Helen K. Runyon	2	2	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Mayor, Barstow	Lawrence E. Dale	17	17	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Mayor, Barstow	Nathaniel H. Pickett	17	17	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Council, Barstow	Joe D. Gomez	19	19	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Council, Barstow	Lance Milanez	20	20	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Council, Barstow	Lucille Stanson	37	37	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Council, Barstow	Manuel Gilbert Gurule	20	20	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Council, Barstow	Paul Luellig	3	3	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Council, Barstow	Susan Wyman	2	2	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Clerk, Barstow	Joanne (JoJo) Cousino	40	40	0				0
San Bernardino	1	City - Clerk, Barstow	Laura Moraco	59	59	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
San Bernardino	1	City - Treasurer, Barstow	Evelyn Radel	99	99	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	42	42	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	56	56	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	71	71	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	27	27	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	10	10	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	88	88	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	55	55	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	42	42	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	55	55	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	41	41	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	57	57	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	38	38	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	21	21	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	55	55	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	38	38	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	36	36	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	56	56	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	38	38	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	53	53	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	53	53	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	36	36	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	65	65	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	21	21	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	65	65	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	21	21	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	66	66	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	19	19	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	67	67	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	17	17	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Local Measure	Measure I - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
San Bernardino	1	Local Measure	Measure I - Vote YES	59	59	0				0
San Bernardino	2	President	David Cobb for President	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	2	President	George W. Bush for President	41	41	0				0
San Bernardino	2	President	John F. Kerry for President	44	44	0				0
San Bernardino	2	President	Leonard Peltier for President	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	2	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	7	7	0				0
San Bernardino	2	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0
San Bernardino	2	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	2	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	22	22	0				0
San Bernardino	2	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	47	47	0				0
San Bernardino	2	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	14	14	0				0
San Bernardino	2	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	10	10	0				0
San Bernardino	2	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	1	1	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
San Bernardino	2	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	2	U.S. House	Fred "Tim" Willoughby	38	38	0				0
San Bernardino	2	U.S. House	Howard P. "Buck" McKeon	50	50	0				0
San Bernardino	2	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	2	State Assembly	Bill Maze	50	50	0				0
San Bernardino	2	State Assembly	Maggie Florez	38	38	0				0
San Bernardino	2	State Assembly	Write-In	1	1	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Mayor, Barstow	Bud Campbell	42	42	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Mayor, Barstow	Carmen M. Hernandez	21	21	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Mayor, Barstow	Helen K. Runyon	2	2	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Mayor, Barstow	Lawrence E. Dale	17	17	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Mayor, Barstow	Nathaniel H. Pickett	17	17	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Council, Barstow	Joe D. Gomez	19	19	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Council, Barstow	Lance Milanez	20	20	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Council, Barstow	Lucille Stanson	37	37	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Council, Barstow	Manuel Gilbert Gurule	20	20	0				0
San	2	City - Council,	Paul Luellig	3	3	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Bernardino		Barstow								
San Bernardino	2	City - Council, Barstow	Susan Wyman	2	2	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Clerk, Barstow	Joanne (JoJo) Cousino	40	40	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Clerk, Barstow	Laura Moraco	59	59	0				0
San Bernardino	2	City - Treasurer, Barstow	Evelyn Radel	99	99	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	42	42	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	56	56	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	71	71	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	27	27	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	10	10	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	88	88	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	55	55	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	42	42	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	55	55	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	41	41	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	57	57	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	38	38	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	21	21	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	55	55	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	38	38	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	36	36	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	56	56	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	38	38	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	53	53	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	53	53	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	36	36	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	48	48	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	65	65	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	21	21	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	65	65	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	21	21	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	66	66	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	19	19	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	67	67	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	17	17	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Local Measure	Measure I - Vote NO	40	40	0				0
San Bernardino	2	Local Measure	Measure I - Vote YES	59	59	0				0

Santa Clara County

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Santa Clara	1	President	George W. Bush for President	31	31	0				0
Santa Clara	1	President	John F. Kerry for President	60	60	0				0
Santa Clara	1	President	Leonard Peltier for President	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	1	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	2	2	0				0
Santa Clara	1	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0
Santa Clara	1	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	1	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	52	52	0				0
Santa Clara	1	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	24	24	0				0
Santa Clara	1	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	11	11	0				0
Santa Clara	1	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	6	6	0				0
Santa Clara	1	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	1	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	1	U.S. House	Douglas Adams McNea	34	34	0				0
Santa Clara	1	U.S. House	Markus Welch	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	1	U.S. House	Zoe Lofgren	57	57	0				0
Santa Clara	1	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Santa Clara	1	State Senate	Elaine Alquist	51	51	0				0
Santa Clara	1	State Senate	Michael Laursen	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	1	State Senate	Shane Patrick Connolly	38	38	0				0
Santa Clara	1	State Senate	Write-In State Senate	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	1	State Assembly	Joe Coto	54	54	0				0
Santa Clara	1	State Assembly	Mark Patrosso	34	34	0				0
Santa Clara	1	State Assembly	Warner S. Bloomberg 3rd	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	1	State Assembly	Write-In	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Judicial	Enrique Colin	34	34	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Judicial	Griffin Bonini	65	65	0				0
Santa Clara	1	School	Cecil Lawson	14	14	0				0
Santa Clara	1	School	Craig Mann	15	15	0				0
Santa Clara	1	School	Juanita Ramirez	5	5	0				0
Santa Clara	1	School	Khanh D. Tran	23	23	0				0
Santa Clara	1	School	Lan Nguyen	4	4	0				0
Santa Clara	1	School	Theresa (Terri) A. Horiye	28	28	00				0
Santa Clara	1	School	Xavier Campos	12	12	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	60	60	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	38	38	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	53	53	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	45	45	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	68	68	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	30	30	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	31	31	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	66	66	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	36	36	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	60	60	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	29	29	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	66	66	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	30	30	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	53	53	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforc ement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	40	40	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	66	66	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	26	26	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	25	25	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	66	66	0				0
Santa Clara	11	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	30	30	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	59	59	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	25	25	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	63	63	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	61	61	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Dat abase Funding. - Vote YES	25	25	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	5	5	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	81	81	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	60	60	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	25	25	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	19	19	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure A - Vote NO	42	42	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure A - Vote YES	57	57	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure B - Vote NO	55	55	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure B - Vote YES	44	44	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure C - Vote NO	69	69	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure C - Vote YES	30	30	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure G - Vote NO	73	73	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure G - Vote YES	26	26	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure K - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure K - Vote YES	36	36	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure N - Vote NO	79	79	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure N - Vote YES	20	20	0				0
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure S - Vote NO	60	60	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Santa Clara	1	Local Measure	Measure S - Vote YES	39	39	0				0
Santa Clara	2	President	George W. Bush for President	31	31	0				0
Santa Clara	2	President	John F. Kerry for President	61	60	1	48			0
Santa Clara	2	President	Leonard Peltier for President	1	1					
Santa Clara	2	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	2	2	0				0
Santa Clara	2	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0
Santa Clara	2	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	2	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	52	51	1	48			0
Santa Clara	2	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	24	24	0				0
Santa Clara	2	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	11	11	0				0
Santa Clara	2	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	6	6					
Santa Clara	2	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	1	1					
Santa Clara	2	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	2	U.S. House	Douglas Adams McNea	34	34	0				0
Santa Clara	2	U.S. House	Markus Welch	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	2	U.S. House	Zoe Lofgren	57	56	1	48			
Santa Clara	2	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Santa Clara	2	State Senate	Elaine Alquist	51	50	1	48	50	50	0
Santa Clara	2	State Senate	Michael Laursen	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	2	State Senate	Shane Patrick Connolly	38	38	0				0
Santa Clara	2	State Senate	Write-In State Senate	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	2	State Assembly	Joe Coto	54	53	1	48	53	53	0
Santa Clara	2	State Assembly	Mark Patrosso	34	34	0				0
Santa Clara	2	State Assembly	Warner S. Bloomberg 3rd	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	2	State Assembly	Write-In	1	1	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Judicial	Enrique Colin	34	33	1	48	33	33	0
Santa Clara	2	Judicial	Griffin Bonini	65	65	0				0
Santa Clara	2	School	Cecil Lawson	14	13	1	48	13	13	0
Santa Clara	2	School	Craig Mann	15	15	0				0
Santa Clara	2	School	Juanita Ramirez	5	5	0				0
Santa Clara	2	School	Khanh D. Tran	23	23	0				0
Santa Clara	2	School	Lan Nguyen	4	4	0				0
Santa Clara	2	School	Theresa (Terri) A. Horiye	28	28	0				0
Santa Clara	2	School	Xavier Campos	12	12	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	60	60	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	38	37	1	48	37	37	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	53	53	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	45	44	1	48	44	44	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	68	67	1	48	67	67	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	30	30	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	31	31	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	66	65	1	48	65	65	
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	36	36	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	60	59	1	48	59	59	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	29	29	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	66	65	1	48	65	65	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	30	29	1	48	29	29	0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	53	53	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	40	39	1	48	39	39	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	66	65	1	48	65	65	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	26	26	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	25	25	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	66	65	1	48	65	65	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	30	30	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	59	58	1	48	58	58	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	25	25	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	63	62	1	48	62	62	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	61	61	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	25	24	1	48	24	24	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	5	5	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	81	80	1	48	80	80	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	60	60	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	25	24	1	48	24	24	0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	19	19	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	65	64	1	48	64	64	0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure A - Vote NO	42	41	1	48	41	41	0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure A - Vote YES	57	57	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure B - Vote NO	55	54	1	48	54	54	0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure B - Vote YES	44	44	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure C - Vote NO	69	68	1	48	68	68	0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure C - Vote YES	30	30	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure G - Vote NO	73	72	1	48	72	72	0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure G - Vote YES	26	26	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure K - Vote NO	63	62	1	48	62	62	0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure K - Vote YES	36	36	0				0
Santa	2	Local	Measure N - Vote NO	79	78	0	48	78	78	0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Clara		Measure								
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure N - Vote YES	20	20	0				0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure S - Vote NO	60	59	0	48	59	59	0
Santa Clara	2	Local Measure	Measure S - Vote YES	39	39	0				0

Shasta County

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Shasta	1	President	George W. Bush for President	50	50	0				0
Shasta	1	President	John F. Kerry for President	43	43	0				0
Shasta	1	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	1	1	0				0
Shasta	1	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0
Shasta	1	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Shasta	1	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	36	36	0				0
Shasta	1	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	37	37	0				0
Shasta	1	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	12	12	0				0
Shasta	1	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	9	9	0				0
Shasta	1	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Shasta	1	U.S. House	Mike Johnson	45	45	0				0
Shasta	1	U.S. House	Wally Herger	47	47	0				0
Shasta	1	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Shasta	1	State Assembly	Barbara McIver	51	51	0				0
Shasta	1	State Assembly	Doug La Malfa	38	38	0				0
Shasta	1	State Assembly	Write-In State Assembly Candidate	1	1	0				0
Shasta	1	County	Mark Cibula	43	43	0				0
Shasta	1	County	Stanley Scott Leach	56	56	0				0
Shasta	1	City	Dick Dickerson	41	41	0				0
Shasta		City	Ken Murray	24	24	0				0
Shasta		City	Mary Leas Stegall	18	18	0				0
Shasta		City	Patrick Henry Jones	18	18	0				0
Shasta		City Treasurer, Shasta	Allyn Feci Clark	99	99	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	33	33	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	35	35	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	51	51	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	47	47	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	23	23	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	73	73	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	52	52	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	41	41	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	26	26	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	67	67	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	52	52	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	40	40	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	33	33	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	24	24	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	31	31	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	57	57	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	23	23	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	63	63	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	34	34	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	52	52	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	69	69	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	16	16	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	27	27	0				0
Shasta	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	57	57	0				0
Shasta	2	President	George W. Bush for President	50	50	0				0
Shasta	2	President	John F. Kerry for President	43	43	0				0
Shasta	2	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	1	1	0				0
Shasta	2	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0
Shasta	2	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Shasta	2	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	36	36	0				0
Shasta	2	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	37	37	0				0
Shasta	2	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	12	12	0				0
Shasta	2	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	9	9	0				0
Shasta	2	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Shasta	2	U.S. House	Mike Johnson	45	45	0				0
Shasta	2	U.S. House	Wally Herger	47	47	0				0
Shasta	2	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Shasta	2	State Assembly	Barbara McIver	51	51	0				0
Shasta	2	State Assembly	Doug La Malfa	38	38	0				0
Shasta	2	State Assembly	Write-In State Assembly Candidate	1	1	0				0
Shasta	2	County	Mark Cibula	43	43	0				0
Shasta	2	County	Stanley Scott Leach	56	56	0				0
Shasta	2	City	Dick Dickerson	41	41	0				0
Shasta	2	City	Ken Murray	24	24	0				0
Shasta	2	City	Mary Leas Stegall	18	18	0				0
Shasta	2	City	Patrick Henry Jones	18	18	0				0
Shasta	2	City Treasurer, Shasta	Allyn Feci Clark	99	99	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	33	33	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	63	63	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	35	35	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	51	51	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	47	47	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	23	23	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	73	73	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	52	52	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	43	43	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	41	41	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	26	26	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	67	67	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	52	52	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	40	40	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	33	33	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	58	58	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	24	24	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	31	31	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	57	57	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	23	23	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	63	63	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	34	34	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	52	52	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	69	69	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	16	16	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	27	27	0				0
Shasta	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	57	57	0				0

Tehama County

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Tehama	1	President	David Cobb for President	1	1	0				0
Tehama	1	President	George W. Bush for President	50	50	0				0
Tehama	1	President	John F. Kerry for President	39	39	0				0
Tehama	1	President	Leonard Peltier for President	1	1	0				0
Tehama	1	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	3	0	0				0
Tehama	1	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0
Tehama	1	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Tehama	1	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	35	35	0				0
Tehama	1	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	38	38	0				0
Tehama	1	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	6	6	0				0
Tehama	1	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	12	12	0				0
Tehama	1	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	3	3	0				0
Tehama	1	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Tehama	1	U.S. House	Mike Johnson	38	38	0				0
Tehama	1	U.S. House	Wally Herger	54	54	0				0
Tehama	1	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0
Tehama	1	State Senate	Barbara McIver	40	41	0				0
Tehama	1	State Senate	Doug La Malfa	49	49	0				0
Tehama	1	State Senate	Write-In St. Assem Candidate	1	1	0				0
Tehama	1	State Assembly	Gary Lloyd Taylor	64	64	0				0
Tehama	1	State Assembly	Thomas E. Moisey	35	35	0				0
Tehama	1	Party Committee	Bob Steinacher	35	35	0				0
Tehama	1	Party Committee	Daniel A. Salado	34	34	0				0
Tehama	1	Party Committee	Janine Wallan	32	32	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	33	33	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	85	85	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	13	13	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	37	37	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	61	61	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	87	87	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	10	10	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	62	62	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	34	34	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	48	48	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	47	47	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	81	81	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	3	3	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	61	61	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	47	47	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	45	45	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	17	17	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	74	74	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	61	61	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	28	28	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	45	45	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	43	43	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	59	59	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	27	27	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	27	27	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	59	59	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	31	31	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	42	42	0				0
Tehama	1	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	42	42	0				0
Tehama	1	Local Measures	Measure A - Vote NO	48	48	0				0
Tehama	1	Local Measures	Measure A - Vote YES	51	51	0				0
Tehama	1	Local Measures	Measure B - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Tehama	1	Local Measures	Measure B - Vote YES	45	45	0				0
Tehama	1	Local Measures	Measure C - Vote NO	65	65	0				0
Tehama	1	Local Measures	Measure C - Vote YES	34	34	0				0
Tehama	2	President	David Cobb for President	0	0	0				0
Tehama	2	President	George W. Bush for President	50	50	0				0
Tehama	2	President	John F. Kerry for President	39	39	0				0
Tehama	2	President	Leonard Peltier for President	0	0	0				0
Tehama	2	President	Michael Anthony Peroutka for President	0	0	0				0
Tehama	2	President	Michael Badnarik for President	4	4	0				0
Tehama	2	President	Write-In Pres Candidate	1	1	0				0
Tehama	2	U.S. Senate	Barbara Boxer	35	35	0				0
Tehama	2	U.S. Senate	Bill Jones	38	38	0				0
Tehama	2	U.S. Senate	Don J. Grundmann	6	6	0				0
Tehama	2	U.S. Senate	James P. "Jim" Gray	12	12	0				0
Tehama	2	U.S. Senate	Marsha Feinland	3	3	0				0
Tehama	2	U.S. Senate	Write-In Sen Candidate	1	1	0				0
Tehama	2	U.S. House	Mike Johnson	38	38	0				0
Tehama	2	U.S. House	Wally Herger	54	54	0				0
Tehama	2	U.S. House	Write-In House Candidate	1	1	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Tehama	2	State Senate	Barbara McIver	41	41	0				0
Tehama	2	State Senate	Doug La Malfa	49	49	0				0
Tehama	2	State Senate	Write-In St. Assem Candidate	1	1	0				0
Tehama	2	State Assembly	Gary Lloyd Taylor	64	64	0				0
Tehama	2	State Assembly	Thomas E. Moisey	35	35	0				0
Tehama	2	Party Committee	Bob Steinacher	35	35	0				0
Tehama	2	Party Committee	Daniel A. Salado	34	34	0				0
Tehama	2	Party Committee	Janine Wallan	32	32	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote NO	33	33	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 1A - Protection of Local Government Revenues - Vote YES	65	65	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote NO	85	85	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 59 - Public Records Open meetings - Vote YES	13	13	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote NO	37	37	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 60 - Election Rights of Political parties. - Vote YES	61	61	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote NO	87	87	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 60A - Surplus Property. - Vote YES	10	10	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote NO	62	62	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 61 - Children's Hospital Projects. Grant Program. - Vote YES	34	34	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote NO	48	48	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 62 - Elections, Primaries, Initiative. - Vote YES	47	47	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote NO	81	81	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 63 - Mental Health Services Expansion Funding. - Vote YES	3	3	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote NO	32	32	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 64 - Limits on Private Enforcement of Unfair Business Competition Laws. - Vote YES	61	61	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote NO	47	47	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 65 - Local Government Funds, Revenues. - Vote YES	45	45	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote NO	17	17	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 66 - Limitations on "Three Strikes" Law. - Vote YES	74	74	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote NO	61	61	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 67 - Emergency Medical Services. Funding. - Vote YES	28	28	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote NO	45	45	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 68 - Non-Tribal Commercial Gambling Expansion. - Vote YES	43	43	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote NO	59	59	0				0

County	Team	Contest	Selection	Initial Comparison			Adjusted for Discrepancy Logs			
				Expected	*Actual*	*Diff.*	*Log #*	*Adjusted Expected*	*Adjusted Actual*	*Adjusted Diff.*
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 69 - DNA Samples Collection Database Funding. - Vote YES	27	27	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote NO	27	27	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 70 - Tribal Gaming Compacts. Exclusive Gaming Rights. - Vote YES	59	59	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 71 - Stem Cell Research. Funding. - Vote YES	31	31	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote NO	42	42	0				0
Tehama	2	Proposition	Prop 72 - Health Care Coverage Requirements. - Vote YES	42	42	0				0
Tehama	2	Local Measures	Measure A - Vote NO	48	48	0				0
Tehama	2	Local Measures	Measure A - Vote YES	51	51	0				0
Tehama	2	Local Measures	Measure B - Vote NO	54	54	0				0
Tehama	2	Local Measures	Measure B - Vote YES	45	45	0				0
Tehama	2	Local Measures	Measure C - Vote NO	65	65	0				0
Tehama	2	Local Measures	Measure C - Vote YES	34	34	0				0

Appendix Y
Overview of All Discrepancy Reports

County	Discrepancy Report Number								
	Affected Tally			Did Not Affect Tally					
	Tester Error	Script Error	Card Activator	Tester Error	Script Error	Equipment Functionality	Card Activator	Videotape Change	Setup/ Close
Alameda				1-4,6,7, 10-12		5-Video stopped 8-time on DRE off			9
Merced	17,18,19			3-16					1,2
Napa				4, 9, 15,16, 20, 22, 25, 31, 32, 34 67, 69, 85, 96, 99,102		2,3,5, 8, 10, 11, 12-Video stopped, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27,29, 33, 37, 39,40,43-63, 65, 66, 68, 70-72, 74-76, 78-84, 86-95, 98, 100,101, 103-106	30, 97	6,7,21,28,35, 36, 38, 41,42, 64,73, 77	1
Orange	15, 16			1-3, 5-10, 12-14	4	11-JBC time is fast			
Plumas	2, 14			1, 3-13					
Riverside				2, 4-23		3			1, 24
San Bernardino				4-15		1-Video operator arrives late			2, 3
Santa Clara	48			1-47					
Shasta				2-12					1
Tehama				4-9, 11-24, 26-37		25, 38	10		1-3

Appendix Z

Parallel Monitoring Program

November 2, 2004

Discrepancy Report

Report No: 17

County:	Merced County	County Team Lead:	Stephanie Golka
Testers involved:	Steve Kawano	Larry Gennette	
Vendor: ES&S	DRE Serial Number: 5120600	Firmware: v 7.4.5.0	

1. Record the test number the team was performing. Test No: 56
2. Record the time the discrepancy occurred: Time: 13:57:38
3. Provide a detailed description of the issue below.

   State measure: Proposition 68 was cast as a "no" vote instead of a "yes" vote as scripted.
4. Has this issue delayed or halted testing **or** will it impact expected results?

   Yes __X__ NO_____ If yes, please call the SOS contact and document the following.

   Name of SOS Contact: _____ Time of Call: _____
5. Summarize the discussion and resolution below:
   IMPACT: The vote count for State measure: Proposition 68-Yes will be under one vote; the vote count for State measure: Proposition 68-No will be over one vote.
6. Does this issue require further action by SOS Office?

   Yes __X__ No_____ If yes, describe the action required below.

   Reconciliation required
7. Ask the County Team Leader to review and, if the Team Leader approves the documentation above, sign off on this Report. Once the report has been signed, the team Leader will record the appropriate information in the Discrepancy Log.
8. Report Completed by: Stephanie Golka
   Signature
9. Report Reviewed and Approved by County Team Lead:
   Stephanie Golka
   Signature

Parallel Monitoring Program

November 2, 2004

Discrepancy Report

Report No: 18

County:	Merced County	County Team Lead:	Stephanie Golka
Testers involved:	Steve Kawano	Larry Gennette	
Vendor: ES&S	DRE Serial Number: 5120600	Firmware: v 7.4.5.0	

1. Record the test number the team was performing. Test No: 56
2. Record the time the discrepancy occurred: Time: 13:57:38
3. Provide a detailed description of the issue below.

   State measure: Proposition 67 was cast as a "yes" vote instead of a "no" vote as scripted.
4. Has this issue delayed or halted testing **or** will it impact expected results?

   Yes __X__ NO_____ If yes, please call the SOS contact and document the following.

   Name of SOS Contact: _____ Time of Call: _____
5. Summarize the discussion and resolution below:
   IMPACT: The vote count for State measure: Proposition 67-No will be under one vote; the vote count for State measure: Proposition 67-Yes will be over one vote.
6. Does this issue require further action by SOS Office?

   Yes __X__ No_____ If yes, describe the action required below.

   Reconciliation required
7. Ask the County Team Leader to review and, if the Team Leader approves the documentation above, sign off on this Report. Once the report has been signed, the team Leader will record the appropriate information in the Discrepancy Log.
8. Report Completed by: Stephanie Golka _____ Signature
9. Report Reviewed and Approved by County Team Lead:

   Stephanie Golka _____ Signature

Parallel Monitoring Program

November 2, 2004

Discrepancy Report

Report No: 19

County:	Merced County	County Team Lead:	Stephanie Golka
Testers involved:	Steve Kawano	Larry Gennette	
Vendor: ES&S	DRE Serial Number: 5120600	Firmware: v 7.4.5.0	

1. Record the test number the team was performing. Test No: 86
2. Record the time the discrepancy occurred: Time: 18:45
3. Provide a detailed description of the issue below.

   Bush for President pressed on screen, but Peroutka for President highlighted. The incorrect selection was not caught review.

4. Has this issue delayed or halted testing **or** will it impact expected results?

   Yes __X__ NO_____ If yes, please call the SOS contact and document the following.

   Name of SOS Contact: _____ Time of Call: _____

5. Summarize the discussion and resolution below:
   IMPACT: The vote count for President: Bush will be under one vote; the vote count for President: Peroutka will be over one vote compared to expected counts.

6. Does this issue require further action by SOS Office?

   Yes __X__ No_____ If yes, describe the action required below.

   Reconciliation required

7. Ask the County Team Leader to review and, if the Team Leader approves the documentation above, sign off on this Report. Once the report has been signed, the team Leader will record the appropriate information in the Discrepancy Log.

8. Report Completed by: Stephanie Golka Signature

9. Report Reviewed and Approved by County Team Lead:

   Stephanie Golka Signature

Parallel Monitoring Program

November 2, 2004

Discrepancy Report

Report No: 15

County:	Orange County	County Team Lead:	Dave Hahn
Testers involved:	Cynthia Willis	Judy Willis	
Vendor: HART	DRE Serial Number: A02FE8	Firmware: 3.4	

1. Record the test number the team was performing. Test No: 7
2. Record the time the discrepancy occurred: Time: 7:45:13
3. Provide a detailed description of the issue below.

   U.S. House of Representative candidate Gary G. Miller selected, but this contest should not have been voted for.

4. Has this issue delayed or halted testing **or** will it impact expected results?

   Yes __X__ NO_____ If yes, please call the SOS contact and document the following.

   Name of SOS Contact: _____ Time of Call: _____

5. Summarize the discussion and resolution below:
   IMPACT: The vote count for the U.S. House contest will have one additional vote than expected.
6. Does this issue require further action by SOS Office?

   Yes __X__ No_____ If yes, describe the action required below.

   Reconciliation required

7. Ask the County Team Leader to review and, if the Team Leader approves the documentation above, sign off on this Report. Once the report has been signed, the team Leader will record the appropriate information in the Discrepancy Log.
8. Report Completed by: Stephanie Golka Stephanie Golka JBWhitney
   Signature
9. Report Reviewed and Approved by County Team Lead:

   Stephanie Golka Stephanie Golka
   Signature

Parallel Monitoring Program

November 2, 2004

Discrepancy Report

Report No: 16

County:	Orange County	County Team Lead:	Dave Hahn
Testers involved:	Cynthia Willis	Judy Willis	
Vendor: HART	DRE Serial Number: A02FE8	Firmware: 3.4	

1. Record the test number the team was performing. Test No: 7
2. Record the time the discrepancy occurred: Time: 7:45:13
3. Provide a detailed description of the issue below.

   School – Trustee Area 3 candidate Gary V. Miller should have been cast.
4. Has this issue delayed or halted testing **or** will it impact expected results?

   Yes __X__ NO_____ If yes, please call the SOS contact and document the following.

   Name of SOS Contact: _____ Time of Call: _____
5. Summarize the discussion and resolution below:
   IMPACT: The vote count for School Trustee Area 3 – Gary V. Miller contest will have one less vote than expected.
6. Does this issue require further action by SOS Office?

   Yes __X__ No_____ If yes, describe the action required below.

   Reconciliation required
7. Ask the County Team Leader to review and, if the Team Leader approves the documentation above, sign off on this Report. Once the report has been signed, the team Leader will record the appropriate information in the Discrepancy Log.
8. Report Completed by: Stephanie Golka Stephanie Golka Signature
9. Report Reviewed and Approved by County Team Lead:

   Stephanie Golka Stephanie Golka Signature

Parallel Monitoring Program

November 2, 2004

Discrepancy Report

Report No: 2

County: Plumas County Team Lead: Jack Falk

Testers involved: Marcia Moreno (Print Name) Jamie White (Print Name)

Vendor: Diebold DRE Serial Number: 100551 Firmware: 4.3.15-D

1. Record the test number the team was performing. Test No: 1-19 *
2. Record the time the discrepancy occurred: Time: 7:00 - 8:55 AM
3. Provide a detailed description of the issue below.

No Candidate's were voted for! See Each script *
Voted as noted.

4. Has this issue delayed or halted testing **or** will it impact expected results?

   Yes X NO * If yes, please call the SOS contact and document the following.

   Name of SOS Contact: Jocelyn Whitney Time of Call: 10:30

5. Summarize the discussion and resolution below:

Discrepancy Report Consolodated for Scripts 1-19

6. Does this issue require further action by SOS Office?

   Yes ____ No ✓ If yes, describe the action required below.

7. Ask the County Team Leader to review and, if the Team Leader approves the documentation above, sign off on this Report. Once the report has been signed, the team Leader will record the appropriate information in the Discrepancy Log.
8. Report Completed by: M Moreno J. White (Print Name) m. mor Jamie White (Signature)
9. Report Reviewed and Approved by County Team Lead: Jack Falk (Print Name) Jack Falk (Signature)

Parallel Monitoring Program

November 2, 2004

Discrepancy Report

Report No: 14

County:	Plumas County	County Team Lead:	Jack Falk
Testers involved:	Jack Falk	Lynda Allen	
Vendor: Diebold	DRE Serial Number: 100686	Firmware: 4.3.15 D	

1. Record the test number the team was performing. Test No: 26
2. Record the time the discrepancy occurred: Time: 9:53
3. Provide a detailed description of the issue below.

   State measure: Proposition 60 was cast as a "yes" vote instead of a "no" vote as scripted.
4. Has this issue delayed or halted testing **or** will it impact expected results?

   Yes __X__ NO_____ If yes, please call the SOS contact and document the following.

   Name of SOS Contact: _____ Time of Call: _____
5. Summarize the discussion and resolution below:
   IMPACT: The vote count for State measure: Proposition 60-No will be under one vote; the vote count for State measure: Proposition 60-Yes will be over one vote.
6. Does this issue require further action by SOS Office?

   Yes __X__ No_____ If yes, describe the action required below.

   Reconciliation required
7. Ask the County Team Leader to review and, if the Team Leader approves the documentation above, sign off on this Report. Once the report has been signed, the team Leader will record the appropriate information in the Discrepancy Log.
8. Report Completed by: Stephanie Golka Stephanie Golka Signature
9. Report Reviewed and Approved by County Team Lead:

   Stephanie Golka Stephanie Golka Signature

Parallel Monitoring Program

November 2, 2004

Discrepancy Report

Report No: 48

County:	Santa Clara County	County Team Lead:	Marini Ballard
Testers involved:	Janel Prince	Blaine Lamb	
Vendor: Sequoia	DRE Serial Number: 25260	Firmware: v 4.2a	

1. Record the test number the team was performing. Test No: 80
2. Record the time the discrepancy occurred: Time:
3. Provide a detailed description of the issue below.

   Entire script was not cast.
4. Has this issue delayed or halted testing **or** will it impact expected results?

   Yes __X__ NO_____ If yes, please call the SOS contact and document the following.

   Name of SOS Contact: _____ Time of Call: _____
5. Summarize the discussion and resolution below:
   IMPACT: The vote count for all contests on script 80 will be different than the expected counts.
6. Does this issue require further action by SOS Office?

   Yes __X__ No_____ If yes, describe the action required below.

   Reconciliation required
7. Ask the County Team Leader to review and, if the Team Leader approves the documentation above, sign off on this Report. Once the report has been signed, the team Leader will record the appropriate information in the Discrepancy Log.
8. Report Completed by: Stephanie Golka
   Signature
9. Report Reviewed and Approved by County Team Lead:
   Stephanie Golka
   Signature