Notes from Poll Watching (Ballot processing) Friday, Oct 19, 2012 at Boulder County Clerks Office by:

Jim August 1605 Denison Cir Longmont, CO 80503 303-776-4514 jim@jfaugust.us

- 1. My background includes working with classified documents on aerospace programs. My objective is to verify that adequate security is provided for all ballots and that all processes are as error proof as possible.
- 2. When copy of certificate was presented to Clerk's staff I signed statement to not reveal any personal information about any voters I might come in contact with.
- 3. I was then given a badge, which is just had a note that identified me as a "Poll Watcher". The badge did not give me any unescorted access to any areas that had locked doors. I was then escorted to the ballot processing area by Sidney Power.
- 4. Once in the processing area I was told that only red ball point pens could be used in that are which made sense because all ballots are to be marked with only blue or black pens. I was then instructed that I could not talk to any of the workers. I need to find out if that is applicable when workers are on break.
- 5. The first process that I observed was removal of cover of signatures from envelopes, counting into groups of 50 then stacking 8 groups of 50 into postal trays. This process was completed by about 12 temporary county employees. I need to notice if non-deliverable are included in the incoming mail then manually separated out at this stage. There were also green and purple envelopes. I asked my escort what was the meaning of the different colored envelops and was told she didn't know but would try to find out. I later found out the green was property ballots and the purple were where ID is required. These were kept separate from the normal blue topped white envelops. There was at least one ballot box brought in without visible marking and the ballots were dumped in with the others. What was the source of these ballots? Is there accounting of the received ballots? Were the same number of ballots dumped out of the box as were in the box when it left it's source?
- 6. After previous step was completed, trays with ballots were placed in a locked roll around cage for security. I thought this was great security.
- 7. The locked cage was then rolled across the hallway to the Honeywell scanner area, unlocked and all trays removed and placed on open shelves. The area is open and various election people were in and out of this area. So much for ballots security, however the large room had locked doors at each end.
- 8. It took several hours to begin scanning ballots since there were problems with the scanner. Part of the problem was a power cord that was caught on part of the scanner. I do not know what the main problems were since I was not allowed to talk to any of the workers. Again, I asked my escort what the functions of the scanner was and what the problems were and was told she didn't know but would try to find out.
- 9. Once scanning was started the scanner grouped most in one bin, which I assume were the good ones. The other bins seemed to have different groups of rejects. I later found out the scanner was reading the bar code on the envelope and also scanning the signature on the envelope.

- 10. The ballots were scanned in batches of about 400. After a batch was scanned the crew of temporary employees started the signature verification process. Most the 12 stations had one person but several had two which left several stations not used. It was my impression that where there was two at one station that at least one person was uncomfortable operating the equipment and/or doing the process.
- 11. Larry Singer and myself were allowed into the scanning room with an escort and needed to stand back of the blue tape on the floor. We complained that we had to stand back to far and were not able to read the computer screens. After ballot signature verification for that batch was completed the blue tape was moved about 6inches closer. It did help some but not enough.
- 12. There are several problems with observing the signature verification process and as well as problems with actual process.
 - a. The process is very subjective. While observing several operators, it was noticed that one person (in the 4th position clockwise from the hall door) rejected about 1 in 10. And another (in the 9th position clockwise from the hall door) only rejected 1 in more than 50. Each of these two people was consistent in their approximate rejection rate. Other operators seem to fall somewhere in between to two extremes. There was a significant variation between the operators.
 - b. Since we as observers were not as close to the screen it was harder for us to do a comparison. Then if we questioned a set of signatures, we were very time limited in reading and recording the name, which the operator did not need to do.
 - c. The bottom signature on the screen was hard to see since the image had dark gray background.
 - d. **I observed several cases of multiple screens of signatures being OKed almost at the same time.** This was caused by simple double clicking the mouse key to go to the next screen. One person (the person at the 6th station clockwise from the door to the hall) just seems to double click and the other person's (the first position clockwise from the door) hand was shaking most of the time, which I think caused several multiple clicks. Maybe these people should not be doing this task. This could be fixed with putting a simply delay in the software to ignore a quick second click but that would require recertification of the software.
 - e. Some ballots appeared to just have printed names in place of signature, is that valid? By the time I noticed the screen was cleared so I don't know if that ballot was accepted or rejected. I am still learning what to look for that we might have some control over.
 - f. The 12th location clockwise from the door which is also the first station to the right of the door seemed to be only used for working on rejected or ballots that required ID. This is where I learn more about what was going on simply by listening. I could not tell for sure if the person operating this station actually accepted or rejected this processed ballots since containers were not marked so I could see. It was impossible for me to read most of the computer screen at this station. There were piles of ballot left by this station when there was no one in the room with doors blocked open. Here is where ballot envelopes were opened looking for IDs.
- 13. When I said anything to my escort about any problems or concerns, I was told that I could file a challenge but nothing would be changed. And then I was given a sheet that identified the very limited reasons for a challenge to be accepted. In the mean time questionable ballot would continue to be counted.
- 14. I am making up a form to help in my taking notes in my next watching period.

Poll Watcher			, Facility Observed		
				, Escort	
Time	Process	Work Station	Concern		

Notes