

Report and Analysis of the 2006 Post-Election Performance Review

Prepared by:

The Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State

Elections Division

April 2007

Overview of Minnesota's 2006 Post-Election Performance Review

The post election performance review of the 2006 General Election was conducted in accordance with Minnesota Statute 206.895. This law requires that the secretary of state monitor and evaluate procedures in selected precincts. Thirty-two precincts, four from each congressional district, were selected at random by the State Canvassing Board (see figure 1 below for a list of all precincts.)

The review was conducted by staff from the Office of Secretary of State and several Minnesota counties.

Note: Information on the 2006 post-election voting system audit can be found on the Secretary of State website under "2006 Election Results."

Scope of the Review

Criteria used to evaluate election procedures in the selected precincts included:

- Ensuring that summary statement statistics were properly entered into the Election Reporting System (ERS) as shown by the county abstract
- Examining sample ballots
- Confirming that precincts and school districts were properly designated on the ballot
- Examining rejected absentee ballots (Uniformed Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA) and regular absentee ballots)
- Reviewing election day registration data
- Reviewing incident log entries
- Verifying that UOCAVA precinct records were complete
- Evaluating the distribution of ballots in split precincts with a school district race on the ballot
- Confirming that voting equipment testing procedures were followed

Results of the Review (see figure 1 below for statistical data from each precinct)

The observations of staff conducting the reviews show proper procedures were followed with relatively few areas for improvement. None of the deficiencies impacted the election results or indicated that any fraudulent activity occurred. Of the issues noted, some were isolated incidents and others appeared to be more prevalent, recurring in multiple precincts.

Some of the recurring issues that were observed include:

- Voter registrations from absentee voters that were properly noted on the election day registration (EDR) blank roster page were not included in the total EDR count entered into ERS, and therefore not reported in the county abstract statistics - (6 precincts)

- The predetermined results chart used for preliminary and public accuracy testing did not contain a different number of valid votes for each candidate within an office - (7 precincts)
- Test deck ballots were not marked “test” - (9 precincts)

Some of the isolated incidents that were observed included:

- Absentee envelopes not marked accepted/rejected (one precinct)
- No EDR stats were entered into ERS (one precinct)
- Absentee ballots from registering voters were not included on the EDR blank roster page (one precinct)
- In split precincts with a school district race on the ballot, election judges issued ballots to individuals from the wrong school district (two precincts)

Some of the successes noted in individual precincts include:

- Materials were in order and organized (three ring binders, color coding, checklists, etc.)
- Election officials were well prepared
- Incident logs were well documented
- New clerks effectively administered state elections for the first time
- Good cooperation/communication between county and municipal election officials
- Informational handouts for individuals attending the public accuracy test
- Detailed notations in the roster for signature issues
- Well secured election materials (seals, security envelopes, etc.)
- In precincts with school districts splits, school districts were highlighted
- Detailed, well designed predetermined results chart

Recommendations

Local election official training conducted by the Office of Secretary of State should emphasize the following:

1. Predetermined results spreadsheets used for preliminary and public accuracy testing need to include varied vote totals for each candidate within an office.
2. Test deck ballots need to be marked “TEST” at the top of each ballot.
3. EDR statistics entered into ERS includes all non-registered absentee voters whose ballots have been accepted.

Concluding Remarks

The data compiled in evaluating procedures in the precincts selected for review show no major issues or areas for concern. The areas noted in this report as needing improvement can be corrected by following the recommendations above.

Overall, election officials in precincts selected for the review performed their duties effectively and administrative procedures were successfully implemented.

We appreciate the assistance, cooperation and valuable feedback from everyone involved in this process.

Figure 1: Post Election Review Data in Individual Precincts

Congressional District	County	Total Voting	Spoiled Ballots	Rejected Absentee Ballots		Turned Away - No EDR Proof	Total EDR
				Regular	UOCAVA		
Congressional District 1							
Rochester W-1 P-2	Olmsted	732	19	0	0	0	131
City of Luverne SE	Rock	620	1	0	0	0	91
City of Winona W-1 P-1	Winona	524	9	0	0	0	50
Ihlen	Pipestone	41	3	1	0	0	3
Congressional District 2							
Sharon Township	Le Sueur	318	8	0	0	0	22
Derrynane Township	Le Sueur	239	1	1	0	0	11
City of Chaska W-1 P-2	Carver	85	1	0	0	0	7
Douglas Township	Dakota	373	21	0	0	0	35
Congressional District 3							
Brookly Park W-C P-6	Hennepin	585	8	0	0	0	96
Maple Grove P-10	Hennepin	866	5	0	0	0	94
Orono P-2	Hennepin	758	6	0	0	2	61
Plymouth W1-P-3	Hennepin	1051	6	5	0	2	124
Congressional District 4							
Arden Hills P-2	Ramsey	1151	29	1	0	4	109
Maplewood P-6	Ramsey	1218	0	1	0	0	146
St. Paul W-3 P-9	Ramsey	1444	26	0	3	1	192
West St. Paul W-3 P-1	Dakota	1021	13	1	0	0	138
Congressional District 5							
Minneapolis W-11 P-7	Hennepin	1706	16	2	1	10	199
Minneapolis W-12 P-6	Hennepin	1220	16	0	0	2	127
New Hope P-2	Hennepin	902	5	0	0	3	139
St. Louis Park W-1 P-1	Hennepin	1912	11	8	0	0	237
Congressional District 6							
Blue Hill Township	Sherburne	636	5	0	0	0	123
City of Elk River W-2 P-2B	Sherburne	1387	19	4	0	0	137
Circle Pines P-2	Anoka	1558	36	4	0	2	159
Linwood Township P-1	Anoka	2393	14	0	0	0	295
Congressional District 7							
Sheridan Township	Redwood	90	5	0	0	0	3
Moltke Township	Sibley	134	2	0	0	0	5
City of Wabasso	Redwood	309	7	0	0	0	30
Wykeham Township	Todd	166	1	0	0	0	11
Congressional District 8							
Sandstone Township	Pine	331	1	0	0	0	32
City of Duluth P-34	St. Louis	1422	12	1	0	0	155
Clear Creek Township	Carlton	55	1	1	0	0	4
City of Wadena P-3	Wadena	674	6	0	0	0	71