

	<p><b>Did they attempt to compare the signatures on the back of the provisional envelope to the signature they had on file? If so, what methods and standards were used?</b></p>
<p><b>Adams</b></p>	<p>Don't check signatures on ballots voted at polls/provisional ballots.</p>
<p><b>Asotin</b></p>	<p>Yes. They use "the 3 point rule." This year all signatures matched. Elaine "They always matched we don't have any crooks here, we have all honest people."</p>
<p><b>Benton</b></p>	<p>Yes. They receive training from election conferences on what to look for. They look at curvature, slant, to see if the letters generally match. They follow "all statutory and administrative procedures." If one staff member doesn't think a signature matches, then two staff members look at it, then if it still doesn't match it goes to the canvassing board. There were no staff level rejection of signature mismatches for provisional ballots this year. This is the most PB they have ever had, usually have between 200-300 in a general election. They also send out update letters to a voter if signature doesn't match.</p>
<p><b>Chelan</b></p>	<p>They do not match signatures on provisional ballots, they are treated as poll ballots, and poll voter signatures are not checked.</p>
<p><b>Clallam</b></p>	<p>Yes. It's an all mail county. To even get a PB the voter has to go to the Auditor's office. Before a voter is given a PB they look them up on the computer and check name/signature. They check signatures again when counting, they look for a number of comparing points, but there is no specific number. If the staff thinks the signature doesn't match, it goes to the canvassing board. The board eyeballs it, they are "very liberal" with what matches, and it's not very often that a signature doesn't match. All signatures matched this year, and they usually do.</p>
<p><b>Clark</b></p>	<p>Yes. Try to find three similarities, but if there are less, then they look closer to see if any consistency. Look for similarities including: beginning letter of names, where the stroke ends, slant, relation of signature to line, size of signature, individual letters within name, place where letter descends below line, unique characteristics (swoops curls), look to see if may have changed over time. If a worker finds a mismatch it goes to the supervisor. If supervisor also thinks it is a mismatch, they will print out any image of the voters signature on file (voter reg. card, absentee ballot request, etc.) and send it to the canvassing board.</p>

	<p><b>Did they attempt to compare the signatures on the back of the provisional envelope to the signature they had on file? If so, what methods and standards were used?</b></p>
<p><b>Columbia</b></p>	<p>Yes. They look at the original voter card/registration forms. If the signature isn't even close then they look for similar letters. If the signature doesn't match they send the voter a letter. They said it wasn't that big of an issue, as they know most of the voters. This year all of the signatures matched, and they usually all do match.</p>
<p><b>Cowlitz</b></p>	<p>Yes. They turn signatures upside down and see if there are "enough" similar characteristics. Questionable ones are sent to the canvassing boards and the canvassing board eyeballs it (all questionable ballots are sent to the canvassing board). This year all of the signatures matched.</p>
<p><b>Douglas</b></p>	<p>Yes. They look for 3 points that are recognizable (slant, capitals). Process: 1 staff rejects, then 3 staff look at it, if still rejected, goes to canvassing board. If the signature doesn't match on the computer they look at the original cards. This time "they really stressed that the girls give people time to sign at the polls" which is why they think all of the signatures matched. Some people signed with only initials, but the initials had enough matching points to count them.</p>
<p><b>Ferry</b></p>	<p>Yes. They look for 3 likenesses, including curvature and slant. They had FBI training. Signatures this year all "clearly matched." One VBM signature was questionable, and clearly wasn't his signature. They sent him a letter. Diana looked at all PB signatures. This is the first year they have had PBs. 8 years ago, they had 2 special ballots.</p>
<p><b>Franklin</b></p>	<p>Yes. (spoke with Christina) They don't use a point do it by points. Just looks to see if match-- first letters, usually obvious. If a staff member thinks there's a mismatch, they ask another staff member. If both workers agree that signature doesn't match, a letter is sent to the voter asking for an update. If the voter doesn't respond to the letter, the ballot goes to the canvassing board.</p>
<p><b>Garfield</b></p>	<p>Yes. Do not have any formal requirements. They look at first letter of name and "other similarities." They have never had a poll site ballot that didn't match, in recent memory. If one didn't match they would send the voter a letter.</p>

	<p><b>Did they attempt to compare the signatures on the back of the provisional envelope to the signature they had on file? If so, what methods and standards were used?</b></p>
<p><b>Grant</b></p>	<p>Yes. Signatures are matched with the computer scanned in version. If staff does not find that they match, it is taken before the canvassing board. 2 out of 3 must agree that it matches. Basically, it is just a side by side comparison of the two signatures--nothing more formal than that.</p>
<p><b>Grays Harbor</b></p>	<p>Yes. They check signatures against the computer. They do things like turn the signature upside down, look at curvature and slant. The signatures usually match. Process: if a staff member rejects for mismatch, then it goes to administration, if administration also rejects it, then it goes to the canvassing board. They had some signatures that went to the canvassing board this year, but they were determined to match.</p>
<p><b>Island</b></p>	<p>Yes. They look to see if letters, size/proportion, or slant is similar. They don't have a specific formula-- they look to see if the signature is different. There were no signatures that weren't cleared up this year. If there are any problems they contacted the voter and the voter either showed ID with their signature or told them why their signature may not have matched-- such as they broke their arm. Sometimes they have spouses that sign for each other, or use power of attorney for a spouse in the army, but same name mismatches not an issue.</p>
<p><b>Jefferson</b></p>	<p>Yes. They prefer six point of matching, and look at curvature, slant, capital letters, however they mainly "look at the signature." It is rare that a signature doesn't match. If a staff thinks there's a mismatch, then multiple staff look at the signature, if they still think it doesn't match, then it goes to the canvassing board. At the canvassing board they look at all things possible to find a match-- capital letter, how i's dotted, t's crossed, look at it upside down. (spoke with Donna)</p>
<p><b>King</b></p>	<p>Yes. They look for three points in common, which can include any similarity in curvature, slope, etc. If a worker thinks a signature doesn't match another more experienced worker looks at it. If both think that the signature doesn't match the ballot is rejected-- it doesn't go to the canvassing board.</p>

	<p><b>Did they attempt to compare the signatures on the back of the provisional envelope to the signature they had on file? If so, what methods and standards were used?</b></p>
<p><b>Kitsap</b></p>	<p>Yes. (spoke with Suzanne) They don't use a specific point system, instead look for similarities like curvature, slope, similar letters in the names. If one worker thinks there's a mismatch they have one or two other permanent staff look at the signatures. If there is still a mismatch, they send a letter to the voter. If the signature is not resolved it goes to the canvassing board. Usually most provisional ballot signatures match, she was surprised/interested to hear that other counties have so many rejections.</p>
<p><b>Kittitas</b></p>	<p>Yes. They look for three points, including curvature, slant, letter similarity. There was one question but it was resolved. If a worker thinks a signature is questionable, then it goes to the supervisor. If there is still a question, then it goes to the canvassing board. The signatures usually match.</p>
<p><b>Klickitat</b></p>	<p>Yes. They verify signatures with voter registration card. They look at curvature, slant, they also take the age of the voter into account. They really try to let signatures in. If a staff member thinks there's a mismatch, then it goes to another staff member, if there is still a mismatch it goes to the canvassing board. Normally the provisional ballot signatures match, there is a bigger problem with absentee ballots. If the signature doesn't match they send a letter.</p>
<p><b>Lewis</b></p>	<p>Yes. They don't have a point system. They look for general similarities such as curvature. They look for anything that looks like it matches. If a staff member thinks a signature doesn't match it is sent to the canvassing board. There are usually a couple that don't match.</p>
<p><b>Lincoln</b></p>	<p>Yes. <i>Don't have a specific number of points they look for. They look for similarities, such as how voter forms letters. If a staff member thinks there's a mismatch, then auditor looks at it. If Auditor also thinks the signature doesn't match, then the voter is contacted to come in and resign a voter card. If there is no resolution then the ballot will go to the canvassing board. Signatures usually match, have rejected some in the past-- usually because the voter didn't respond to the auditor's office requests to come in.</i></p>

	<p><b>Did they attempt to compare the signatures on the back of the provisional envelope to the signature they had on file? If so, what methods and standards were used?</b></p>
<p><b>Mason</b></p>	<p><i>Yes. There are no specific requirements, as a "rule of thumb" they follow guidelines (they can provide no written guidelines) taught to them by a state patrolman they look at curvatures, slant, they try and match signatures. If a worker can match the signature it goes to the canvassing board. Usually provisional ballots match.</i></p>
<p><b>Okanogan</b></p>	<p>Yes, but they had no mismatches. Their standard was to look for 3 points of similarity -- Anything under 5 points of similarity was sent to CB</p>
<p><b>Pacific</b></p>	<p><i>Yes. They use 3 point matching. They have never had a mismatched signature on a provisional ballot, but if they did it would go to the canvassing board. Overall they usually don't have that many signatures that don't match-- it's usually signed with an X (no witnesses), power of attorney, or spouse signed.</i></p>
<p><b>Pend Oreille</b></p>	<p>Yes. They do not have a point system. They mainly look to make sure that the first letter matches. Then look if there are other similarities, such as curvature and slope. If a worker (Britney) doesn't think that the signature matches, she may have another worker look at it. If both people agree it's a mismatch a letter is sent to the voter. If the signature is not cleared up then it goes to the canvassing board.</p>
<p><b>Pierce</b></p>	<p>Yes, had a total of 34 ballots not counted. <i>They were trained/attended presentations at state conferences. They do not go by a point system, they look at slopes, curvature, a combination of things to see if there is enough similarities between the signatures. If a worker thinks there is a discrepancy, then it goes to a supervisor, and if it is still not resolved it goes to the canvassing board. They also send letters to the voter if there are signature issues.</i></p>
<p><b>San Juan</b></p>	<p><i>Yes. They don't have a point system-- they look for similarities between the signatures, letters, slant. Usually the signatures match, if there is a staff question then it would go to the canvassing board.</i></p>

	<p><b>Did they attempt to compare the signatures on the back of the provisional envelope to the signature they had on file? If so, what methods and standards were used?</b></p>
<p><b>Skagit</b></p>	<p>Yes, but they had NO miscompares. <i>They do not have a specific point system, they look at curvature and slope and other similarities. If a worker has a question, they call the voter and ask them to describe their signature over the phone-- if there are distinguishing marks or reasons why their signature may not match. They do not have the voter sign a new voter registration form. If there is no resolution the ballot will go to the canvassing board. They will also allow variations on names. In provisional ballots, the signatures tend to vote.</i></p>
<p><b>Skamania</b></p>	<p>Yes. They use no set point system, they just "eyeball it" to see if the signatures match. If a staff member thinks it doesn't match, then another staff member looks at it. If it still doesn't match it goes to Mike, and then a letter is sent to the voter. All which don't match are sent to canvassing board (board looks at all ballots).</p>
<p><b>Snohomish</b></p>	<p>Yes, but she thinks there were none rejected. Staff asked to take a second look if they thought it didn't match. Look for any similarity at all, including any individual letter. They always erred in favor of the voter. If staff couldn't see it, it was sent to the lead staff person to see if that person could find a similarity. If not, it was sent to the Supervisor and Manager, who reviewed these together. Finally, any that remained after those 3 levels of review were sent to the CB.</p>
<p><b>Spokane</b></p>	<p>Yes, but none rejected. Spoke to County Auditor on 11.30 -- she told me the following concerning the standard applied to look for nonmatching provisionals: Same as what is used for ABs. They look at surname first. If it has same basic characteristics, they count the ballot. If not clear from the surname, they look to rest of name. Nothing is in writing.</p>
<p><b>Stevens</b></p>	<p>They do not check signatures on provisional ballots.</p>
<p><b>Thurston</b></p>	<p>Yes; believe that the number rejected was about 8 (Barbara Sandahl-- <i>have provisional breakdown, not absentee</i>). Keith Mullen believes that they look for three points, including pace, slant, height, style, but said to also check with Barbara.</p>

	<b>Did they attempt to compare the signatures on the back of the provisional envelope to the signature they had on file? If so, what methods and standards were used?</b>
<b>Wahkiakum</b>	No
<b>Walla Walla</b>	No
<b>Whatcom</b>	Yes; They were given training by the Secret Service. This was passed on to temp staff. If there was any problem, it was sent. Things to look for: Don't look at beginning, but rather at the end. Slant. (2 most important things are end and the slant). Told at one point to look at the signature upside down (didn't do that this year).
<b>Whitman</b>	No -- they looked for a registration, but did not compare any signatures on provisionals. (They did not have any missing signatures, to Eunice's recollection)
<b>Yakima</b>	Yes, but only 1 signature did not compare (sent letter, no response, ballot not counted) -- Use the procedure used for absentees. Look for style, slant, age of the file signature (if it just looks like deterioration, these are sent a letter requesting an update, but the ballot is counted and the ballot not even sent to the CB), "required to have" 3 points of similarity. If a staff member thinks it's questionable, they first send it to the Elections Manager and Office Manager. At least 4 people look at the signatures before they even get to the CB.

County	Provisional Rejection Rate for Nonmatching Signature		Number of Provisional Ballots Cast		Number of Provisionals Rejected		Absentee Rejection Rate for Nonmatching Signature		Number of Absentee Ballots Cast		Number of Absentees Rejected		Number of Absentees Rejected for Nonmatching Signature
	Provisional Rejection Rate for Nonmatching Signature	Provisional Rejection Rate for Nonmatching Signature	Number of Provisional Ballots Cast	Number of Provisionals Rejected	Number of Provisionals Rejected	Number of Provisionals Rejected	Absentee Rejection Rate for Nonmatching Signature	Absentee Rejection Rate for Nonmatching Signature	Number of Absentee Ballots Cast	Number of Absentees Rejected	Number of Absentees Rejected	Number of Absentees Rejected	
Adams	0.00%	0.00%	108	35	0	0	0.06%	0.06%	4,778	19	3	3	
Asotin	0.00%	0.00%	408	55	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	3,751	0	0	0	
Benton	0.00%	0.00%	1,494	243	0	0	0.04%	0.04%	42,023	131	17	17	
Chelan	0.00%	0.00%	832	173	0	0	0.13%	0.13%	24,350	117	31	31	
Columbia	0.00%	0.00%	103	53	0	0	0.08%	0.08%	37,454	152	30	30	
Clark	0.42%	0.42%	5,214	944	22	22	0.16%	0.16%	122,440	755	199	199	
Columbia	0.00%	0.00%	22	7	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	1,531	0	0	0	
Cowlitz	0.00%	0.00%	1,007	122	0	0	0.10%	0.10%	35,586	154	34	34	
Douglas	0.00%	0.00%	391	101	0	0	0.04%	0.04%	10,298	48	4	4	
Ferry	0.00%	0.00%	25	8	0	0	0.03%	0.03%	3,402	16	1	1	
Franklin	1.60%	1.60%	500	153	8	8	0.29%	0.29%	6,665	80	19	19	
Garfield	0.00%	0.00%	10	5	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	996	0	0	0	
Grant	1.98%	1.98%	251	76	5	5	0.00%	0.00%	16,689	72	0	0	
Grays Harbor	0.01%	0.01%	17,217	340	2	2	0.06%	0.06%	20,345	74	13	13	
Island	0.00%	0.00%	845	170	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	25,666	117	0	0	
Jefferson	1.09%	1.09%	275	59	3	3	0.01%	0.01%	13,709	6	2	2	
King	1.30%	1.30%	31,904	1,791	415	415	0.27%	0.27%	566,333	4,111	1,561	1,561	
Kitsap	0.07%	0.07%	2,819	534	2	2	0.11%	0.11%	93,293	575	102	102	
Kittitas	0.00%	0.00%	880	168	0	0	0.39%	0.39%	10,469	78	41	41	
Klickitat	0.00%	0.00%	181	67	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	5,051	11	0	0	

EXHIBIT 2

1

Affidavit of Joshua C. Jungman



County	Provisional Rejection Rate for Nonmatching Signature	Number of Provisional Ballots Cast	Number of Provisionals Rejected	Number of Provisionals Rejected for Nonmatching Signature	Absentee Rejection Rate for Nonmatching Signature	Number of Absentee Ballots Cast	Number of Absentees Rejected	Number of Absentees Rejected for Nonmatching Signature
Lewis	0.55%	183	51	1	0.10%	32,735	173	32
Lincoln	0.00%	92	18	0	0.00%	4,610	18	0
Mason	0.00%	511	124	0	0.02%	17,613	76	3
Okanogan	0.00%	81	25	0	0.10%	16,704	90	16
Pacific	0.00%	139	36	0	0.01%	8,023	30	1
Pend Oreille	5.56%	18	11	1	0.16%	6,300	27	10
Pierce	0.01%	9,203	1,993	1	0.07%	248,739	2,008	180
San Juan	0.00%	61	49	0	0.07%	6,888	28	5
Skagit	0.07%	1,528	307	1	0.02%	30,744	221	5
Skamania	0.00%	28	2	0	0.23%	5,219	26	12
Snohomish	0.60%	8,709	1,469	52	0.03%	194,671	1,126	52
Spokane	0.00%	5,302	1,284	0	0.01%	133,081	706	8
Stevens	0.00%	568	164	0	0.01%	10,482	32	1
Thurston	0.62%	4,973	808	31	0.00%	84,795	534	0
Wahkiakum	0.00%	10	4	0	0.04%	2,255	4	1
Walla Walla	0.00%	473	131	0	0.12%	15,502	117	19
Whatcom	0.00%	3,751	513	0	0.05%	67,261	113	35
Whitman	0.00%	1,002	219	0	0.75%	6,283	126	47
Yakima	0.03%	3,197	488	1	0.13%	56,410	104	72
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11.9364%</b>	<b>95,863</b>	<b>11,445</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>0.5285%</b>	<b>1,847,433</b>	<b>11,611</b>	<b>2,382</b>

EXHIBIT 2

2

Affidavit of Joshua C. Jungman