

GESSLER ELECTION INTEGRITY LISTENING TOUR
JIM FLETCHER REPORT
NOVEMBER 5, 2012

INTRODUCTION

In August, 2012 I volunteered to lead an effort to organize Republican watchers. Other than voting in every election since 1968, I had not had much involvement in the political process other than once being an alternate to the Colorado State Convention and once being an election judge. My experiences in organizing, training, scheduling and debriefing approximately 150 watchers here in Boulder County brings me here today to summarize problems that I personally observed occurring during the voting, processing and counting of ballots. These observations along with others from watchers have been documented in detail reports that can be found on either of the following websites:

www.coloradovotergroup.org Election Integrity-Watcher
http://www.dansher.com/BC_CB/2012_BC_CB.html

The reading of the Colorado Statutes and Rules relative to watchers would make one think that a watcher is an integral part of the election process, but my experience here in Boulder County supports a different narrative. From my first meeting in late September with Hillary Hall and Molly Tayer of the Boulder County Clerk's office through the November 6 election day, I experienced at best resistance to at worst animosity and disdain for the efforts of the watchers. A few examples:

- Refusing to process Watcher Certificates of Appointment (10/8)
- Refusing to allow watchers to observe UOCAVA process (9/26-10/20)
- Refusing to provide process or procedures for mail ballots (10/8-11/6)
- Refusing to converse or discuss issues with watchers (10/8-11/6)
- Intimidating watchers by requesting to see their notes or following them to restroom
- Not providing a knowledgeable election judge to interface with watchers (10/8-11/6)
- Creating a sense of mistrust toward watchers from election workers (10/8-11/6)

Quotes from Hillary Hall to myself:

In not allowing watching of the UOCAVA process (10/8), "This is how we are processing this election. This is how we process every election. Do what you want with that!"

In the Clerk's office during UOCAVA processing (10/20), "I am in a lawsuit with you (not true) and I will not answer any questions!"

PRIMARY AREAS OF CONCERN

UOCAVA Ballot Processing

I observed the UOCAVA ballot processing on seven separate occasions from 10/20 through 10/29. The watchers were required to stand on the public side of the counter in the 2nd Floor entry area of the Clerk's Office. Initially there was no communication provided to the watchers by any election judge as to the process, nor would the election judges answer any questions or accept any comments. The watchers could not see the computer screens to determine how the emails and attachments were stored and there was no indication on how the emails were secured. Apparently there were not written procedures as Hillary was providing instructions to workers and making adjustments as needed.

1. Receipt of requests from electors is not open to watchers.
2. Return of ballots is not open to watchers.
3. Logging of return ballots is not effectively open to watchers.
4. Duplication of ballots is not open to watchers.

Request of the SOS: Insist of the Clerk's that watchers be fully integrated into this process including the witnessing and verification of each step including the viewing of the computer emails, letters and faxes from electors. This should also include training on the Clerk's procedures.

Group Residential Facilities (Title 1 Election Code 1-8-112)

1. Mail ballots are not being secured as described in the Statute.
2. Ballots are being left with no verification that voter actually voted the ballot.

Request of the SOS: Provide additional Rules that assure continuous custody of the ballots and bi-partisan assistance to the voter.

Mail Ballot Processing

The ballot processing center encompassed an area with approximate dimensions of 125' by 60' with several distinct rooms. I observed the mail ballot process on nine separate occasions from 10/16 through 11/6. The watchers were unable to effectively witness and verify the ballot storage area; the envelope signature scanning; the signature verification; the printing of ballots in the processing center and the ballot scanning. The election judges could not or would not answer any questions from the watcher. The watcher did not have access to an election judge or worker to whom he could register a complaint or challenge an elector. Election workers did not wear name tags indicating affiliation, therefore watchers could not verify if bi-partisan teams were working.

1. Watchers could not observe the envelope scanner output screen to verify counts or reject logs.
2. There was one election worker at each signature verification station with a total of 12 stations. Rejected signatures were analyzed by one person with access to voting records and party affiliation.
3. Watchers could not be effective with only one allowed in the large processing center.
4. Watchers were originally prevented from getting closer than 6 feet to the signature verification screens which made it practically impossible to observe the signatures or information, four at a time on a 10" by 12" screen.
5. The scanned signatures were being verified on average in two seconds with some as little as one second.
6. The scanned signatures being verified by the election worker were not large enough or clear enough for adequate analysis.
7. There was not enough time for the watcher to witness and verify the validity of a signature.
8. Signatures that had a witness were automatically accepted.
9. I observed an election worker that was verifying rejected signatures leave his work station without logging off. (10/24)
10. I observed lack of ballots and envelopes being secured on several occasions. For example, I observed ballots and envelopes sitting in open rooms with no election worker present. I observed open and unsecured east door to processing center on 10/28.
11. I was denied a request to see the daily logs of rejected ballots. (10/27)
12. On 10/28 during ballot resolution, I observed that the ballot scanner had produced a vertical line through several candidate boxes. The resolution process was stopped and the "batch of ballots" was rescanned. Since an individual ballot cannot be traced, it appears that this particular batch and maybe other could have been double counted or not counted.

Request of the SOS:

- 1. Develop and implement specific rules that require bi-partisan teams to view and verify all signatures.**
- 2. Develop and implement specific rules that required that envelopes and ballots be in secure cages as they move through the processing center.**
- 3. Develop and implement specific rules that require name tag IDs with affiliation for all election workers and judges to assist in bi-partisan verification.**
- 4. Develop and implement specific rules that require Clerks to develop and publish written procedures for all ballot processing functions.**

SUMMARY

I am requesting that the SOS provide leadership in eliminating the overall animosity shown by the Boulder County Clerk toward watchers. If enforced the watcher statutes can be effective in providing the necessary oversight that will instill in the electorate the confidence that their vote is being counted and not nullified by someone trying to subvert the system. Convenience should not be substituted for voter integrity and voter integrity should not be interpreted as voter suppression.

Respectively Submitted

Jim Fletcher
499 South Cedar Brook Road
Boulder, CO 80304
(303) 589-2250
jim.fletcher@comcast.net