

**Analysis and Report of
Overvotes and Undervotes
for the 2002 General Election
Pursuant to Section 101.595, Florida Statutes**

January 31, 2003



Florida Department of State
Division of Elections
Room 100, Collins Building
107 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250
(850) 245-6200

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Introduction and Methodology	3
Analysis of County Data.....	3
Finding 1: New Voting Systems Reduce Level of Overvotes and Undervotes.....	3
Finding 2: Voter Education was Effective in Contributing to Reduction in Level of Overvotes and Undervotes	6
Finding 3: Level of Overvotes and Undervotes can be Dramatically Affected by Close Contests and Voter Interest.....	6
Finding 4: All Voting System Companies Need to Continue Improving the Design of Their Voting Systems.....	8
Finding 5: Some of the Ballot Instructions Were Confusing to Voters.....	8
Recommendations.....	8
EXHIBIT 1: Section 101.595, Florida Statutes, Analysis and Reports of Voting Problems.....	10
EXHIBIT 2: Division of Elections' Memorandum to Supervisors of Elections.....	11
EXHIBIT 3: Governor/Lieutenant Governor Contest, Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-ins Voting Systems Order, 2002 General Election.....	12
EXHIBIT 4: True Undervotes Versus Mismarked Ballots.....	16
EXHIBIT 5: Blank or Spoiled Ballots in the Last Presidential Election by Percentage, 2000 Presidential Election	18
EXHIBIT 6: Change from November 2000 to November 2002 in Overvote, Undervote and Invalid Write-in Percentage.....	21
EXHIBIT 7: United States Congressional Contests, Overvotes and Undervotes Voting Systems Order, 2002 General Election.....	24

INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1: Governor/Lieutenant Governor Contest, Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-ins by Voting System, 2002 General Election.....	4
Table 2: Presidential Contest, Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-ins Percentage by Voting System, 2000 General Election	5
Table 3: Comparison Extract of Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-ins Percentage from 2000 and 2002 General Elections	5
Table 4: United States House of Representatives, District 4 Official Results, 2002 General Election.....	7
Table 5: United States House of Representatives, District 4 Party Affiliation of Registered Voters, 2002 General Election	7
Table 6: Problems Encountered with Voting System Design.....	8

Executive Summary

Pursuant to section 101.595, Florida Statutes, as enacted in 2001 and amended in 2002, (Exhibit 1) following each General Election, each supervisor of elections reports to the Department of State on the total number of overvotes and undervotes in the first race appearing on the ballot, along with the likely reasons for such overvotes and undervotes. The supervisors of elections are also required to report such other information as may be useful in evaluating the performance of their voting systems and identifying problems with ballot design and instructions which may have contributed to voter confusion.

Pursuant to section 97.021(21), Florida Statutes, "Overvote" means that the elector marks or designates more names than there are persons to be elected to an office or designates more than one answer to a ballot question, and the tabulator records no vote for the office or question.

Pursuant to section 97.021(34), Florida Statutes, "Undervote" means that the elector does not properly designate any choice for an office or ballot question, and the tabulator records no vote for the office or question.

The Division of Elections analyzed the information reported by the supervisors of elections pursuant to section 101.595, Florida Statutes, and made these findings:

- (1) Replacement of central count optical scan and punch card voting systems with precinct count optical scan and touch screen voting systems dramatically reduced the level of overvotes and undervotes.
- (2) Voter education measures by the counties, partially funded by the 2001 Legislature, were effective in contributing to the reduction in the level of overvotes and undervotes.
- (3) A high level of undervotes in one Congressional District contest, where an incumbent faced a write-in challenger in counties whose registered voters were predominantly members of the incumbent's opposing party, suggests that the level of undervotes can be dramatically affected by close contests and voter interest.
- (4) All voting system companies need to continue to improve the design of their voting systems in order to better meet the needs of Florida's voters.
- (5) Some of the ballot instructions were confusing to voters.

The Division of Elections proposes the following recommendations based on the analyzed information.

- (1) The Division of Elections should continue to monitor the overvotes and undervotes from each General Election.

- (2) The Florida Legislature should provide funding, contingent upon appropriations from Congress through the Help America Vote Act, to the counties for voter education efforts.
- (3) The division should review the recommendations for ballot instructions for incorporation into the uniform ballot rule.
- (4) All voting system vendors should continue to improve the design of their voting systems in order to better meet the needs of Florida's voters.

Introduction and Methodology

The Division of Elections sent a memorandum on November 22, 2002 (Exhibit 2) to all supervisors of elections requesting information for their counties from the November 5, 2002 General Election on: (1) the number of overvotes and undervotes from absentee ballots, overvotes and undervotes from precinct ballots and the number of invalid write-ins for the Governor and Lieutenant Governor contest; (2) the number of overvotes and undervotes from absentee ballots, and overvotes and undervotes from precinct ballots for each United States House of Representatives contest; (3) problems encountered with ballot design or instructions which may have contributed to voter confusion; (4) recommendations for correcting ballot confusion; (5) problems encountered with voting systems design; and (6) recommendations for correcting voting system design problems.

Although the statute only requires the information to be reported on the first race appearing on the ballot, the division also requested information on the Governor and Lieutenant Governor race so that data could be analyzed on a statewide race for better comparisons.

The Division of Elections organized and analyzed overvote, undervote and invalid write-in information by contest, voting system and county. The Division of Elections organized and summarized problems and recommendations concerning ballot design, ballot instructions and voting system design into categories based on supervisor of elections' responses.

Following analysis of the information, the Division of Elections proposes recommendations.

Analysis of County Data

Finding 1: New Voting Systems Reduce Level of Overvotes and Undervotes

Replacement of central count optical scanner and punch card voting systems with precinct count optical scanner and touch screen voting systems dramatically reduced the level of overvotes and undervotes.

Table 1
Governor/Lieutenant Governor Contest
Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-ins by Voting System
2002 General Election (from Exhibit 3)

	Undervotes Absentee Ballots	Overvotes Absentee Ballots	Undervotes Precinct Ballots	Overvotes Precinct Ballots	Invalid Write-ins	Overvotes, Undervotes, & Invalid Write-ins Total	Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-ins as % of Turnout
Diebold Accuvote (Optical Scanner - Precinct)	1,082	115	4,963	148	1,447	7,755	0.49 %
30 Counties	0.07 %	0.01 %	0.31 %	0.01 %	0.09 %	0.49 %	
ES&S M100 (Optical Scanner - Precinct)	377	77	1,341	274	178	2,247	0.89 %
14 Counties	0.15 %	0.03 %	0.53 %	0.11 %	0.07 %	0.89 %	
ES&S Optech (Optical Scanner - Precinct)	375	293	1,498	246	374	2,786	0.56 %
7 Counties	0.08 %	0.06 %	0.30 %	0.05 %	0.07 %	0.56 %	
Sequoia Optech (Optical Scanner - Precinct)	17	7	32	21	9	86	1.30 %
1 County	0.26 %	0.11 %	0.48 %	0.32 %	0.14 %	1.30 %	
ES&S iVotronic (Touch Screen - Precinct) (See Note 2)	1,882	247	15,829	0	1,271	19,229	1.12 %
11 Counties	0.11 %	0.01 %	0.92 %	0.00 %	0.07 %	1.12 %	
Sequoia EDGE (Touch Screen - Precinct) (See Note 2)	672	382	10,074	0	803	11,931	1.11 %
4 Counties	0.06 %	0.04 %	0.93 %	0.00 %	0.08 %	1.11 %	
Total	4,405	1,121	33,737	689	4,082	44,034	0.86 %
67 Counties	0.09 %	0.02 %	0.66 %	0.01 %	0.08 %	0.86 %	

- Notes:**
1. Due to rounding, individual percentages may not add exactly to the summary percentages.
 2. Absentee Ballot Undervotes in the ES&S iVotronic and Sequoia EDGE touch screen counties include results from both marksense absentee ballots and voting prior to election day on touch screen voting terminals.

Overall, the percentage of uncounted ballots decreased from 2.93% in the 2000 Presidential Election to 0.86% in the 2002 Gubernatorial Election.

Except for the use of touch screen voting systems (which preclude overvoting), voting systems themselves do not appear to be a significant cause of differences in the distribution of overvotes, undervotes and invalid write-ins in the Governor and Lieutenant Governor contest as illustrated in Table 1.

The supervisors of elections estimated that 98% of all undervoted ballots were true undervotes with only 2% representing mismarked ballots (Exhibit 4). This estimate was based on a sample of their observed absentee ballots.

Table 2
Presidential Contest
Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-ins Percentage by Voting System
2000 General Election (from Exhibit 5)

Voting System	Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-in Votes as % of Turnout
Paper Ballots	6.32 %
Optical Scanner (Central)	5.68 %
Punch Cards (Central)	3.93 %
Lever Machine	0.89 %
Optical Scanner (Precinct)	0.83 %

The overvotes, undervotes and invalid write-in votes for the Governor and Lieutenant Governor contest as a percentage of turnout of 0.86 (see Table 1) is similar to the 0.83 percentage of turnout (see Table 2) for overvotes, undervotes and invalid write-in votes in the November 2000 Presidential contest for those counties using precinct optical scanners.

All counties that changed from central count optical scanners, punch card tabulators and paper ballots to precinct-based touch screen terminals and precinct-based optical scanners saw a dramatic reduction in the level of overvotes, undervotes and invalid write-in votes in the Governor's contest in November 2002 compared to the similar level in the Presidential contest in November 2000. Table 3 illustrates these dramatic reductions in counties that had used central count optical scanners and punch card tabulators and were at the highest level and lowest level of overvotes, undervotes and invalid write-in votes in the November 2000 Presidential contest for the voting system used.

Table 3
Comparison Extract of Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-ins
Percentage from 2000 and 2002 General Elections (from Exhibits 3, 5 and 6)

County	2000 Voting System	2000 Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Votes as % of Turnout	2002 Voting System	2002 Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Votes as % of Turnout
Gadsden	Optical Scanner (Central)	12.40 %	ES&S M100 (Optical Scanner – Precinct)	1.00 %
Glades	Punch Cards (Central)	9.59 %	Diebold Accuvote (Optical Scanner – Precinct)	0.37 %
Lake	Optical Scanner (Central)	3.67 %	ES&S iVotronic (Touch Screen – Precinct)	1.20 %
Palm Beach	Punch Cards (Central)	6.43 %	Sequoia EDGE (Touch Screen – Precinct)	1.20 %
Sarasota	Punch Cards (Central)	1.71 %	ES&S iVotronic (Touch Screen – Precinct)	1.30 %
Union	Paper Ballots	6.32 %	ES&S M100 (Optical Scanner – Precinct)	1.20 %

Finding 2: Voter Education was Effective in Contributing to Reduction in Level of Overvotes and Undervotes

Voter education measures by the counties, partially funded by the 2001 Legislature, were effective in contributing to the reduction in the level of overvotes and undervotes.

In addition to implementing new voting systems, the implementation of expanded county voter education programs by the supervisors of elections also appears to have contributed to the tremendous reduction in the level of overvotes, undervotes and invalid write-in votes. One-time grants funded by the 2001 Legislature made possible or greatly enhanced these county voter education programs.

All forty counties that changed from central count optical scanners, punch card tabulators and paper ballots to new voting systems also had accompanying voter education programs that contributed both to the success of new voting systems and to the tremendous reduction in the level of overvotes, undervotes and invalid write-in votes.

Of the twenty-six counties that did not change voting systems, eighteen of them still had a significant reduction in the level of overvotes, undervotes and invalid write-in votes which appears to be attributable to their successful voter education programs.

The remaining eight counties that did not change systems already had excellent levels of overvotes, undervotes and invalid write-in votes compared to turnout ranging from 0.18% (Leon County) to 0.48% (Alachua County) in the November 2000 General Election. This made them the eight best counties in this category for the State of Florida in the November 2000 Election. In the November 2002 General Election, they continued to have good levels of overvotes, undervotes and invalid write-in votes ranging from 0.38% (Flagler County) to 0.64% (Alachua County) in the November 2002 General Election.

Additional information on the effectiveness of voter education programs is contained in a separate report prepared by the Department of State.

Finding 3: Level of Overvotes and Undervotes can be Dramatically Affected by Close Contests and Voter Interest

A high level of undervotes in one Congressional District contest, where an incumbent faced a write-in challenger in counties whose registered voters were predominantly members of the incumbent's opposing party, suggests that the level of undervotes can be dramatically affected by close contests and voter interest.

The United States House of Representatives, District 4 contest had double-digit percentages of undervotes in all nine counties as illustrated in Table 4. This contest featured a write-in challenger to a Republican incumbent candidate. The write-in challenger received 0.3% of the votes on those ballots that marked a choice in the District 4 contest, while the incumbent received 99.7% of the votes on those ballots that marked a choice in the District 4 contest. As illustrated in Table 5, all but two counties in District 4 are predominantly Democratic in terms of registered voters. District 4 counties used

Diebold Accuvote, ES&S iVotronic, ES&S M100 and Sequoia Optech voting systems as shown in Table 4.

Table 4
United States House of Representatives, District 4 Official Results
2002 General Election

United States House of Representatives, District 4						
County	Ander Crenshaw (REP)	Charles S. Knause (WRI)	Turnout	Number of Undervotes	% of Undervotes	Voting System Used
Baker	4,820	2	6,611	1,629	24.66 %	Sequoia Optech
Columbia	11,827	25	16,453	4,152	25.24 %	Diebold Accuvote
Duval	125,901	217	151,833	21,676	14.28 %	Diebold Accuvote
Hamilton	1,861	133	3,375	1,207	35.76 %	ES&S M100
Jefferson	1,377	6	2,598	1,087	41.84 %	Diebold Accuvote
Leon	3,150	42	5,570	2,103	37.76 %	Diebold Accuvote
Madison	3,570	6	5,927	2,135	36.02 %	Diebold Accuvote
Nassau	16,129	12	21,376	5,084	23.78 %	ES&S iVotronic
Union	2,517	66	3,495	912	26.09 %	ES&S M100
Total	171,152	509	217,238	39,985	18.41 %	
Percent	99.7 %	0.3 %				

Note: Turnout in Duval, Jefferson and Leon Counties is only for the District 4 portions of the counties.

Table 5
United States House of Representatives, District 4
Party Affiliation of Registered Voters
2002 General Election

County	Republican	Democrat	Minor Parties	No Party Affiliation	Total
Baker	2,059	9,007	103	420	11,589
Columbia	9,106	19,613	859	2,556	32,134
Duval	119,174	98,474	11,056	33,091	261,795
Hamilton	938	6,104	99	257	7,398
Jefferson	603	2,931	40	158	3,732
Leon	2,037	4,856	184	685	7,762
Madison	1,511	8,634	118	351	10,614
Nassau	16,372	16,534	930	4,062	37,898
Union	902	5,097	52	266	6,317
Total	152,702	171,250	13,441	41,846	379,239

Finding 4: All Voting System Companies Need to Continue Improving the Design of Their Voting Systems

All voting system companies need to continue improving the design of their voting systems in order to better meet the needs of Florida’s voters.

**Table 6
Problems Encountered with Voting System Design**

Category	Number of Responses	Sub-Category	Number of Responses
ES&S	5		
		M100 Ballot Optical Scanner Ballot Boxes Jam	2
		Need an “Are You Sure” Prompt on Scanned Ballot Acceptance for M100 Optical Ballot Scanner	1
		Alarm Not Loud Enough on M100 Optical Ballot Scanner	1
		iVotronic Touch Screen Units Overheat	1
Diebold	3		
		Audio Ballot Lacking	1
		Improvements to GEMS Software Needed	1
		Need to Separate Ballot Pages When Doing a Recount	1
Sequoia	1		
		Lacking Reports for Absentees, Provisionals and Precincts in Breaking Out Overvotes and Undervotes	1
Other	1		
		Excessive Absentee Ballot Folds	1
Total	10		

As shown in Table 6, ten supervisors of elections responded to the voting system design question making comments concerning the need for all three voting systems companies (Diebold, ES&S and Sequoia) to improve the design of their voting systems in order to better meet the needs of Florida’s voters.

Finding 5: Some of the Ballot Instructions Were Confusing to Voters

The 2001 Legislature required the Department of State to adopt a uniform ballot rule for each voting system. Several supervisors of elections commented that the ballot instructions in Rule 1S-2.032 were confusing to voters. The instructions relating to the marking device and instructions for absentee ballots appeared to be the most confusing.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the Division of Elections makes these recommendations:

- (1) The Division of Elections should continue to monitor the overvotes and undervotes from each General Election.
- (2) The Florida Legislature should provide funding, contingent upon appropriations from Congress through the Help America Vote Act, to the counties for voter education efforts.
- (3) The division should review the recommendations for ballot instructions for incorporation into the uniform ballot rule.
- (4) All voting system vendors should continue to improve the design of their voting systems in order to better meet the needs of Florida's voters.

EXHIBIT 1

101.595 Analysis and reports of voting problems.

(1) No later than December 15 of each general election year, the supervisor of elections in each county shall report to the Department of State the total number of overvotes and undervotes in the first race appearing on the ballot pursuant to s. 101.151(2), along with the likely reasons for such overvotes and undervotes and other information as may be useful in evaluating the performance of the voting system and identifying problems with ballot design and instructions which may have contributed to voter confusion.

(2) The Department of State, upon receipt of such information, shall prepare a public report on the performance of each type of voting system. The report must contain, but is not limited to, the following information:

(a) An identification of problems with the ballot design or instructions which may have contributed to voter confusion;

(b) An identification of voting system design problems; and

(c) Recommendations for correcting any problems identified.

(3) The Department of State shall submit the report to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by January 31 of each year following a general election.

History.--s. 24, ch. 2001-40; s. 16, ch. 2002-17.

EXHIBIT 2

MEMORANDUM

TO: Supervisors of Elections

FROM: Ed Kast, Director

DATE: November 22, 2002

SUBJECT: Reports due December 15

As you are aware, the Legislature has ordered two new reports pertaining to the General Election. Supervisors of Elections are required to report information to the Division of Elections by December 15, 2002. The Division will compile the information in the county reports and provide the results to the Legislature by January 31, 2003.

Section 101.595, F.S., requires a report on the number of overvotes and undervotes in the 1st race appearing on the ballot. Since some of you had Congressional races as your first race and others had the Governor's race, we are asking that all counties include the Governor's race so that we will be able to ascertain the information required on a statewide race. Therefore, many of you will be giving us information on your Congressional races as well as the Governor's race. We have developed a web site that you can enter your information on. Once your information has been entered and saved, print the form, sign it and mail it to us. You may access this site at: soe.dos.state.fl.us. Once you put in your county name (no spaces) and password (password is report), the screen should be county-specific to the races on your ballot and to your type of voting system. We are asking that you estimate the percentage of true undervotes vs. mismarked ballots based on your experience in reviewing the absentee ballots. We recognize that this will be an educated guess but we are trying to determine if there were ballot problems that caused voters to mismark ballots or if the voters just decided not to vote in a particular race or races.

Section 98.255, F.S., requires that you report in detail the voter education programs you conducted during the 2002 election cycle. Enclosed please find the form in which to comply with the statute. Because the Department must report on the effectiveness of these programs, we are asking that you rank each program in the order of their effectiveness in your county. You should also provide copies of any documents that you produced as part of the voter education efforts in your county. In addition to reporting information to the Legislature, we will use this information as a basis for revisions to the rule requiring minimum standards for voter education.

Thank you for your cooperation in getting this information to us. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to let us know.

EK/SJB

Enclosure

EXHIBIT 3

Governor/Lieutenant Governor Contest Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-ins Voting Systems Order 2002 General Election

County	Voting System Vendor	Type	Gov/ Lt Gov Turnout	Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Absentee Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Absentee Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Precinct Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Precinct Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov No. of Invalid Write-ins	Gov/ Lt Gov Total	% Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Absentee Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Absentee Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Precinct Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Precinct Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov No. of Invalid Write-ins	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-in % Turnout	2000 Presidential Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-in % Turnout
Alachua	Diebold	M	70,820	57	0	273	0	122	452	0.08%	0.00%	0.39%	0.00%	0.17%	0.64%	0.48%
Brevard	Diebold	M	193,274	80	5	515	50	145	795	0.04%	0.00%	0.27%	0.03%	0.08%	0.41%	0.27%
Calhoun	Diebold	M	4,303	3	4	41	0	4	52	0.07%	0.09%	0.95%	0.00%	0.09%	1.21%	1.48%
Citrus	Diebold	M	52,996	47	0	156	7	60	270	0.09%	0.00%	0.29%	0.01%	0.11%	0.51%	0.38%
Columbia	Diebold	M	16,453	12	6	92	4	8	122	0.07%	0.04%	0.56%	0.02%	0.05%	0.74%	3.61%
DeSoto	Diebold	M	7,286	12	1	15	1	8	37	0.16%	0.01%	0.21%	0.01%	0.11%	0.51%	8.24%
Dixie	Diebold	M	4,076	2	0	11	0	6	19	0.05%	0.00%	0.27%	0.00%	0.15%	0.47%	6.64%
Duval	Diebold	M	243,993	147	18	896	8	182	1,251	0.06%	0.01%	0.37%	0.00%	0.07%	0.51%	9.23%
Flagler	Diebold	M	25,836	10	2	68	1	16	97	0.04%	0.01%	0.26%	0.00%	0.06%	0.38%	0.31%
Gilchrist	Diebold	M	5,117	1	0	40	0	5	46	0.02%	0.00%	0.78%	0.00%	0.10%	0.90%	5.15%
Glades	Diebold	M	2,970	2	0	9	0	0	11	0.07%	0.00%	0.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.37%	9.59%
Hardee	Diebold	M	5,413	4	0	40	0	5	49	0.07%	0.00%	0.74%	0.00%	0.09%	0.91%	6.20%
Hernando	Diebold	M	58,036	29	1	288	4	38	360	0.05%	0.00%	0.50%	0.01%	0.07%	0.62%	0.43%
Jefferson	Diebold	M	5,806	7	4	28	0	5	44	0.12%	0.07%	0.48%	0.00%	0.09%	0.76%	9.19%
Leon	Diebold	M	94,602	103	8	342	0	132	585	0.11%	0.01%	0.36%	0.00%	0.14%	0.62%	0.18%
Levy	Diebold	M	11,292	12	0	91	1	8	112	0.11%	0.00%	0.81%	0.01%	0.07%	0.99%	5.68%
Madison	Diebold	M	5,927	10	0	28	0	5	43	0.17%	0.00%	0.47%	0.00%	0.08%	0.73%	7.23%
Manatee	Diebold	M	101,678	33	3	218	8	70	332	0.03%	0.00%	0.21%	0.01%	0.07%	0.33%	1.30%
Monroe	Diebold	M	25,817	37	2	84	2	25	150	0.14%	0.01%	0.33%	0.01%	0.10%	0.58%	0.61%
Okaloosa	Diebold	M	56,823	143	3	42	0	17	205	0.25%	0.01%	0.07%	0.00%	0.03%	0.36%	1.07%
Okeechobee	Diebold	M	8,634	9	3	60	6	9	87	0.10%	0.03%	0.69%	0.07%	0.10%	1.01%	8.00%
Osceola	Diebold	M	48,118	13	1	61	1	30	106	0.03%	0.00%	0.13%	0.00%	0.06%	0.22%	2.94%
Polk	Diebold	M	143,107	60	8	313	24	148	553	0.04%	0.01%	0.22%	0.02%	0.10%	0.39%	0.57%
Putnam	Diebold	M	22,440	14	0	70	8	25	117	0.06%	0.00%	0.31%	0.04%	0.11%	0.52%	0.64%
Seminole	Diebold	M	119,968	38	28	389	7	109	571	0.03%	0.02%	0.32%	0.01%	0.09%	0.48%	0.24%
St. Lucie	Diebold	M	67,817	62	5	248	4	57	376	0.09%	0.01%	0.37%	0.01%	0.08%	0.55%	0.82%
Taylor	Diebold	M	6,050	10	3	28	0	9	50	0.17%	0.05%	0.46%	0.00%	0.15%	0.83%	8.16%
Volusia	Diebold	M	159,809	100	10	418	10	177	715	0.06%	0.01%	0.26%	0.01%	0.11%	0.45%	0.27%

**Governor/Lieutenant Governor Contest
Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-ins Voting Systems Order
2002 General Election (continued)**

County	Voting System Vendor	Type	Gov/ Lt Gov Turnout	Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Absentee Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Absentee Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Precinct Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Precinct Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov No. of Invalid Write-ins	Gov/ Lt Gov Total	% Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Absentee Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Absentee Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Precinct Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Precinct Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov No. of Invalid Write-ins	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-in % Turnout	2000 Presidential Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-in % Turnout
Wakulla	Diebold	M	8,524	10	0	35	1	13	59	0.12%	0.00%	0.41%	0.01%	0.15%	0.69%	4.68%
Walton	Diebold	M	15,694	15	0	64	1	9	89	0.10%	0.00%	0.41%	0.01%	0.06%	0.57%	1.18%
Diebold Accuvote Total			1,592,679	1,082	115	4,963	148	1,447	7,755	0.07%	0.01%	0.31%	0.01%	0.09%	0.49%	2.28%
			-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Bay	ES&S	M	49,157	92	51	162	125	12	442	0.19%	0.10%	0.33%	0.25%	0.02%	0.90%	1.11%
Bradford	ES&S	M	7,898	10	1	49	9	10	79	0.13%	0.01%	0.62%	0.11%	0.13%	1.00%	7.87%
Franklin	ES&S	M	3,855	24	0	20	1	4	49	0.62%	0.00%	0.52%	0.03%	0.10%	1.27%	8.26%
Gadsden	ES&S	M	15,442	26	1	106	13	9	155	0.17%	0.01%	0.69%	0.08%	0.06%	1.00%	12.40%
Gulf	ES&S	M	5,517	43	1	44	0	9	97	0.78%	0.02%	0.80%	0.00%	0.16%	1.76%	6.41%
Hamilton	ES&S	M	3,375	14	0	42	8	5	69	0.41%	0.00%	1.24%	0.24%	0.15%	2.04%	8.94%
Hendry	ES&S	M	6,440	9	0	57	2	0	68	0.14%	0.00%	0.89%	0.03%	0.00%	1.06%	9.05%
Highlands	ES&S	M	30,268	16	7	209	12	28	272	0.05%	0.02%	0.69%	0.04%	0.09%	0.90%	2.79%
Jackson	ES&S	M	15,033	47	7	114	18	23	209	0.31%	0.05%	0.76%	0.12%	0.15%	1.39%	6.70%
Lafayette	ES&S	M	2,619	13	1	35	3	10	62	0.50%	0.04%	1.34%	0.11%	0.38%	2.37%	6.49%
Liberty	ES&S	M	2,433	6	3	34	1	4	48	0.25%	0.12%	1.40%	0.04%	0.16%	1.97%	7.24%
Marion	ES&S	M	95,688	45	3	404	77	54	583	0.05%	0.00%	0.42%	0.08%	0.06%	0.61%	3.16%
Suwannee	ES&S	M	11,171	22	1	43	3	3	72	0.20%	0.01%	0.38%	0.03%	0.03%	0.64%	5.55%
Union	ES&S	M	3,495	10	1	22	2	7	42	0.29%	0.03%	0.63%	0.06%	0.20%	1.20%	6.32%
ES&S M100 Total			252,391	377	77	1,341	274	178	2,247	0.15%	0.03%	0.53%	0.11%	0.07%	0.89%	4.24%
			-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

**Governor/Lieutenant Governor Contest
Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-ins Voting Systems Order
2002 General Election (continued)**

County	Voting System Vendor	Type	Gov/ Lt Gov Turnout	Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Absentee Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Absentee Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Precinct Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Precinct Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov No. of Invalid Write-ins	Gov/ Lt Gov Total	% Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Absentee Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Absentee Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Precinct Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Precinct Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov No. of Invalid Write-ins	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-in % Turnout	2000 Presidential Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-in % Turnout
Clay	ES&S	M	51,049	23	26	94	28	21	192	0.05%	0.05%	0.18%	0.05%	0.04%	0.38%	0.71%
Escambia	ES&S	M	93,020	26	44	276	46	55	447	0.03%	0.05%	0.30%	0.05%	0.06%	0.48%	3.61%
Holmes	ES&S	M	5,677	3	3	34	7	5	52	0.05%	0.05%	0.60%	0.12%	0.09%	0.92%	1.84%
Orange	ES&S	M	241,947	121	192	738	116	232	1,399	0.05%	0.08%	0.31%	0.05%	0.10%	0.58%	0.85%
Santa Rosa	ES&S	M	43,986	23	10	149	21	25	228	0.05%	0.02%	0.34%	0.05%	0.06%	0.52%	0.72%
St. Johns	ES&S	M	56,237	73	16	167	23	23	302	0.13%	0.03%	0.30%	0.04%	0.04%	0.54%	0.87%
Washington	ES&S	M	7,019	106	2	40	5	13	166	1.51%	0.03%	0.57%	0.07%	0.19%	2.37%	3.94%
ES&S Optech Total			498,911	375	293	1,498	246	374	2,786	0.08%	0.06%	0.30%	0.05%	0.07%	0.56%	1.45%
Baker	Sequoia	M	6,611	17	7	32	21	9	86	0.26%	0.11%	0.48%	0.32%	0.14%	1.30%	1.69%
Sequoia Optech Total			6,611	17	7	32	21	9	86	0.26%	0.11%	0.48%	0.32%	0.14%	1.30%	1.69%
Broward	ES&S	D	443,935	283	28	3,986	0	436	4,733	0.06%	0.01%	0.90%	0.00%	0.10%	1.07%	2.49%
Charlotte	ES&S	D	60,634	43	10	637	0	35	725	0.07%	0.02%	1.05%	0.00%	0.06%	1.20%	4.57%
Collier	ES&S	D	84,213	34	6	601	0	39	680	0.04%	0.01%	0.71%	0.00%	0.05%	0.81%	3.34%
Miami-Dade	ES&S	D	508,604	996	102	4,627	0	425	6,150	0.20%	0.02%	0.91%	0.00%	0.08%	1.21%	4.37%
Lake	ES&S	D	82,490	46	1	884	0	63	994	0.06%	0.00%	1.07%	0.00%	0.08%	1.20%	3.67%
Lee	ES&S	D	163,855	140	28	1,089	0	88	1,345	0.09%	0.02%	0.66%	0.00%	0.05%	0.82%	2.43%
Martin	ES&S	D	53,993	78	0	455	0	32	565	0.14%	0.00%	0.84%	0.00%	0.06%	1.05%	0.89%
Nassau	ES&S	D	21,376	9	2	105	0	9	125	0.04%	0.01%	0.49%	0.00%	0.04%	0.58%	6.32%
Pasco	ES&S	D	131,337	77	58	1,562	0	77	1,774	0.06%	0.04%	1.19%	0.00%	0.06%	1.35%	2.67%
Sarasota	ES&S	D	141,004	168	12	1,596	0	56	1,832	0.12%	0.01%	1.13%	0.00%	0.04%	1.30%	1.71%
Sumter	ES&S	D	23,018	8	0	287	0	11	306	0.03%	0.00%	1.25%	0.00%	0.05%	1.33%	3.35%
ES&S iVotronic Total (See Note 2)			1,714,459	1,882	247	15,829	0	1,271	19,229	0.11%	0.01%	0.92%	0.00%	0.07%	1.12%	3.19%

**Governor/Lieutenant Governor Contest
Overvotes, Undervotes and Invalid Write-ins Voting Systems Order
2002 General Election (continued)**

County	Voting System Vendor	Type	Gov/ Lt Gov Turnout	Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Absentee Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Absentee Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Precinct Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Precinct Ballots	Gov/ Lt Gov No. of Invalid Write-ins	Gov/ Lt Gov Total	% Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Absentee Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Absentee Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Undervotes Precinct Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes Precinct Ballots	% Gov/ Lt Gov No. of Invalid Write-ins	Gov/ Lt Gov Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-in % Turnout	2000 Presidential Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-in % Turnout
Hillsborough	Sequoia	D	314,685	181	17	2,203	0	218	2,619	0.06%	0.01%	0.70%	0.00%	0.07%	0.83%	2.48%
Indian River	Sequoia	D	44,798	13	12	401	0	26	452	0.03%	0.03%	0.90%	0.00%	0.06%	1.01%	3.77%
Palm Beach	Sequoia	D	381,210	0	250	4,043	0	284	4,861	0.00%	0.07%	1.06%	0.00%	0.07%	1.20%	6.43%
Pinellas	Sequoia	D	338,733	478	103	3,427	0	275	4,283	0.14%	0.03%	1.01%	0.00%	0.08%	1.26%	2.09%
Sequoia Edge Total (See Note 2)			1,079,426	672	382	10,074	0	803	11,931	0.06%	0.04%	0.93%	0.00%	0.07%	1.11%	3.82%
			-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Grand Total (See Note 2)			5,144,477	4,405	1,121	33,737	689	4,082	44,034	0.09%	0.02%	0.66%	0.01%	0.08%	0.86%	2.93%
			-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

- Notes:**
1. Due to rounding, individual percentages may not add exactly to the summary percentages.
 2. Absentee Ballot Undervotes in the ES&S iVotronic and Sequoia EDGE touch screen counties include results from both marksense absentee ballots and voting prior to election day on touch screen voting terminals.

EXHIBIT 4

True Undervotes Versus Mismarked Ballots*

County Name	True Undervotes	Mismarked Ballots	Total
Alachua	99 %	1 %	100 %
Baker	97 %	3 %	100 %
Bay	98 %	2 %	100 %
Bradford	97 %	3 %	100 %
Brevard	100 %	0 %	100 %
Broward	70 %	30 %	100 %
Calhoun	90 %	10 %	100 %
Charlotte	96 %	4 %	100 %
Citrus	100 %	0 %	100 %
Clay	99 %	1 %	100 %
Collier	98 %	2 %	100 %
Columbia	98 %	2 %	100 %
Miami-Dade	99 %	1 %	100 %
DeSoto	100 %	0 %	100 %
Dixie	100 %	0 %	100 %
Duval	100 %	0 %	100 %
Escambia	80 %	20 %	100 %
Flagler	100 %	0 %	100 %
Franklin	99 %	1 %	100 %
Gadsden	100 %	0 %	100 %
Gilchrist	100 %	0 %	100 %
Glades	100 %	0 %	100 %
Gulf	99 %	1 %	100 %
Hamilton	100 %	0 %	100 %
Hardee	100 %	0 %	100 %
Hendry	100 %	0 %	100 %
Hernando	100 %	0 %	100 %
Highlands	99 %	1 %	100 %
Hillsborough	100 %	0 %	100 %
Holmes	98 %	2 %	100 %
Indian River	90 %	10 %	100 %
Jackson	99 %	1 %	100 %
Jefferson	100 %	0 %	100 %
Lafayette	100 %	0 %	100 %
Lake	100 %	0 %	100 %
Lee	100 %	0 %	100 %
Leon	99 %	1 %	100 %
Levy	100 %	0 %	100 %
Liberty	99 %	1 %	100 %

True Undervotes Versus Mismarked Ballots* (continued)

County Name	True Undervotes	Mismarked Ballots	Total
Madison	100 %	0 %	100 %
Manatee	96 %	4 %	100 %
Monroe	100 %	0 %	100 %
Marion	97 %	3 %	100 %
Martin	75 %	25 %	100 %
Nassau	99 %	1 %	100 %
Okaloosa	99 %	1%	100 %
Okeechobee	100 %	0 %	100 %
Orange	99 %	1 %	100 %
Osceola	99 %	1 %	100 %
Palm Beach	100 %	0 %	100 %
Pasco	100 %	0 %	100 %
Pinellas	95 %	5 %	100 %
Polk	100 %	0 %	100 %
Putnam	100 %	0 %	100 %
Santa Rosa	100 %	0 %	100 %
Sarasota	100 %	0 %	100 %
Seminole	100 %	0 %	100 %
St. Johns	99 %	1 %	100 %
St. Lucie	100 %	0 %	100 %
Sumter	99 %	1 %	100 %
Suwannee	100 %	0 %	100 %
Taylor	100 %	0 %	100 %
Union	99 %	1 %	100 %
Volusia	100 %	0 %	100 %
Wakulla	100 %	0 %	100 %
Walton	100 %	0 %	100 %
Washington	95 %	5 %	100 %
	-----	-----	-----
Total	98%	2 %	100 %
	-----	-----	-----

* Estimates provided by supervisors of elections based on a sample of absentee ballots.

EXHIBIT 5

Chart 4
Blank or Spoiled Ballots in the Last Presidential Election by Percentage
2000 Presidential Election

Source: Orlando Sentinel survey of all 67 county elections supervisors in Florida (11/14/00). With updates by Collins Center for Public Policy, Inc. (1/30/01).

COUNTY	VOTING SYSTEM	TOTAL PRES. VOTE **	ALL BALLOTS CAST ***	BLANK OR SPOILED BALLOTS	
				NUMBER	%
Martin	Lever Machine	62,013	62,570	557	0.89%
Sub-Total	Lever Machine	62,013	62,570	557	0.89%
Union	Paper Ballots	3,826	4,084	258	6.32%
Sub-Total	Paper Ballots	3,826	4,084	258	6.32%
Bradford	Optical Scanner (Central)	8,673	9,414	741	7.87%
Charlotte	Optical Scanner (Central)	66,896	70,100	3,204	4.57%
Franklin	Optical Scanner (Central)	4,651	5,070	419	8.26%
Gadsden	Optical Scanner (Central)	14,727	16,812	2,085	12.40%
Gulf	Optical Scanner (Central)	6,144	6,565	421	6.41%
Hamilton	Optical Scanner (Central)	3,964	4,353	389	8.94%
Hendry	Optical Scanner (Central)	8,139	8,949	810	9.05%
Jackson	Optical Scanner (Central)	16,300	17,470	1,170	6.70%
Lafayette	Optical Scanner (Central)	2,505	2,679	174	6.49%
Lake	Optical Scanner (Central)	88,611	91,989	3,378	3.67%
Levy	Optical Scanner (Central)	12,724	13,490	766	5.68%
Liberty	Optical Scanner (Central)	2,410	2,598	188	7.24%
Okeechobee	Optical Scanner (Central)	9,864	10,722	858	8.00%
Suwannee	Optical Scanner (Central)	12,457	13,189	732	5.55%
Taylor	Optical Scanner (Central)	6,808	7,413	605	8.16%
Sub-Total	Optical Scanner (Central)	264,873	280,813	15,940	5.68%

Chart 4
Blank or Spoiled Ballots in the Last Presidential Election by Percentage
2000 Presidential Election (continued)

COUNTY	VOTING SYSTEM	TOTAL PRES. VOTE **	ALL BALLOTS CAST ***	BLANK OR SPOILED BALLOTS	
				NUMBER	%
Alachua	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	85,729	86,144	415	0.48%
Baker	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	8,160	8,300	140	1.69%
Bay	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	58,857	59,520	663	1.11%
Brevard	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	218,395	218,989	594	0.27%
Calhoun	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	5,178	5,256	78	1.48%
Citrus	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	57,251	57,468	217	0.38%
Clay	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	57,353	57,764	411	0.71%
Columbia	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	18,513	19,206	693	3.61%
Escambia	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	116,769	121,141	4,372	3.61%
Flagler	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	27,111	27,194	83	0.31%
Hernando	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	65,219	65,500	281	0.43%
Holmes	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	7,400	7,539	139	1.84%
Leon	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	103,196	103,377	181	0.18%
Manatee	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	110,221	111,676	1,455	1.30%
Monroe	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	33,887	34,095	208	0.61%
Okaloosa	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	70,747	71,512	765	1.07%
Orange	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	280,125	282,529	2,404	0.85%
Polk	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	168,607	169,582	975	0.57%
Putnam	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	26,248	26,416	168	0.64%
Santa Rosa	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	50,319	50,684	365	0.72%
Seminole	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	137,634	137,970	336	0.24%
St. Johns	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	60,781	61,313	532	0.87%
St. Lucie	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	78,060	78,709	649	0.82%
Volusia	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	183,653	184,153	500	0.27%
Walton	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	18,318	18,537	219	1.18%
Washington	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	8,024	8,353	329	3.94%
Sub-Total	Optical Scanner (Precinct)	2,055,755	2,072,927	17,172	0.83%

Chart 4
Blank or Spoiled Ballots in the Last Presidential Election by Percentage
2000 Presidential Election (continued)

COUNTY	VOTING SYSTEM	TOTAL PRES. VOTE **	ALL BALLOTS CAST ***	BLANK OR SPOILED BALLOTS	
				NUMBER	%
Broward *	Punch Card (Central)	573,306	587,928	14,622	2.49%
Collier	Punch Card (Central)	92,141	95,325	3,184	3.34%
DeSoto	Punch Card (Central)	7,811	8,512	701	8.24%
Dixie	Punch Card (Central)	4,666	4,998	332	6.64%
Duval	Punch Card (Central)	264,717	291,626	26,909	9.23%
Gilchrist	Punch Card (Central)	5,395	5,688	293	5.15%
Glades	Punch Card (Central)	3,365	3,722	357	9.59%
Hardee	Punch Card (Central)	6,233	6,645	412	6.20%
Highlands	Punch Card (Central)	35,149	36,158	1,009	2.79%
Hillsborough	Punch Card (Central)	360,295	369,467	9,172	2.48%
Indian River	Punch Card (Central)	49,614	51,559	1,945	3.77%
Jefferson	Punch Card (Central)	5,643	6,214	571	9.19%
Lee	Punch Card (Central)	184,377	188,978	4,601	2.43%
Madison	Punch Card (Central)	6,162	6,642	480	7.23%
Marion	Punch Card (Central)	102,656	106,001	3,345	3.16%
Miami-Dade *	Punch Card (Central)	625,362	653,963	28,601	4.37%
Nassau	Punch Card (Central)	23,782	25,387	1,605	6.32%
Osceola	Punch Card (Central)	55,658	57,341	1,683	2.94%
Palm Beach *	Punch Card (Central)	432,286	461,988	29,702	6.43%
Pasco	Punch Card (Central)	142,731	146,648	3,917	2.67%
Pinellas	Punch Card (Central)	398,469	406,956	8,487	2.09%
Sarasota	Punch Card (Central)	160,942	163,749	2,807	1.71%
Sumter	Punch Card (Central)	22,261	23,032	771	3.35%
Wakulla	Punch Card (Central)	8,595	9,017	422	4.68%
Sub-Total	Punch Card (Central)	3,571,616	3,717,544	145,928	3.93%
Total	All Voting Systems	5,958,083	6,137,938	179,855	2.93%

Notes:

- * Uncertified figures from three counties result in unofficial statewide totals.
- ** Includes all 10 presidential candidates on Florida ballot, plus valid write-ins.
- *** Includes absentee ballots, which tend to increase the number of "blank or spoiled ballots."

Optical Scanner (Central) means marked ballots are tabulated by machine at a central elections office.
 Optical Scanner (Precinct) means marked ballots are tabulated by machines at precinct level.
 Punch Card (Central) means punch card ballots are tabulated centrally.

From the "Revitalizing Democracy in Florida: The Final Report of the Governor's Select Task Force on Elections Procedures, Standards and Technology" by the Collins Center, March 1, 2001, pages 31 and 32.

Available for download at –
http://www.collinscenter.org/usr_doc/Revitalizing_Democracy_in_Florida.pdf

EXHIBIT 6

Change from November 2000 to November 2002 in Overvote, Undervote and Invalid Write-in Percentage

County	Nov 2000 Presidential Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-in %	Nov 2002 Gov/Lt Gov Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid %	Increase in % from 2000 to 2002	Comments
Alachua	0.48%	0.64%	Increase	Same Voting System - Diebold
Baker	1.69%	1.30%		Same Voting System - Sequoia
Bay	1.11%	0.90%		Same Voting System - ES&S
Bradford	7.87%	1.00%		
Brevard	0.27%	0.41%	Increase	Same Voting System - Diebold
Broward	2.49%	1.07%		
Calhoun	1.48%	1.21%		Same Voting System - Diebold
Charlotte	4.57%	1.20%		
Citrus	0.38%	0.51%	Increase	Same Voting System - Diebold
Clay	0.71%	0.38%		Same Voting System - ES&S
Collier	3.34%	0.81%		
Columbia	3.61%	0.74%		Same Voting System - Diebold
Miami-Dade	4.37%	1.21%		
DeSoto	8.24%	0.51%		
Dixie	6.64%	0.47%		
Duval	9.23%	0.51%		
Escambia	3.61%	0.48%		Same Voting System - ES&S
Flagler	0.31%	0.38%	Increase	Same Voting System - Diebold
Franklin	8.26%	1.27%		
Gadsden	12.40%	1.00%		
Gilchrist	5.15%	0.90%		
Glades	9.59%	0.37%		
Gulf	6.41%	1.76%		
Hamilton	8.94%	2.04%		
Hardee	6.20%	0.91%		
Hendry	9.05%	1.06%		
Hernando	0.43%	0.62%	Increase	Same Voting System - Diebold
Highlands	2.79%	0.90%		

Change from November 2000 to November 2002 in Overvote, Undervote and Invalid Write-in Percentage (continued)

County	Nov 2000 Presidential Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-in %	Nov 2002 Gov/Lt Gov Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid %	Increase in % from 2000 to 2002	Comments
Hillsborough	2.48%	0.83%		
Holmes	1.84%	0.92%		Same Voting System - ES&S
Indian River	3.77%	1.01%		
Jackson	6.70%	1.39%		
Jefferson	9.19%	0.76%		
Lafayette	6.49%	2.37%		
Lake	3.67%	1.20%		
Lee	2.43%	0.82%		
Leon	0.18%	0.62%	Increase	Same Voting System - Diebold
Levy	5.68%	0.99%		
Liberty	7.24%	1.97%		
Madison	7.23%	0.73%		
Manatee	1.30%	0.33%		Same Voting System - Diebold
Monroe	0.61%	0.58%		Same Voting System - Diebold
Marion	3.16%	0.61%		
Martin	0.89%	1.05%	Increase	Previous Voting System - Lever Machine
Nassau	6.32%	0.58%		
Okaloosa	1.07%	0.36%		Same Voting System - Diebold
Okeechobee	8.00%	1.01%		
Orange	0.85%	0.58%		Same Voting System - ES&S
Osceola	2.94%	0.22%		
Palm Beach	6.43%	1.20%		
Pasco	2.67%	1.35%		
Pinellas	2.09%	1.26%		
Polk	0.57%	0.39%		Same Voting System - Diebold
Putnam	0.64%	0.52%		Same Voting System - Diebold
Santa Rosa	0.72%	0.52%		Same Voting System - ES&S
Sarasota	1.71%	1.30%		
Seminole	0.24%	0.48%	Increase	Same Voting System - Diebold
St. Johns	0.87%	0.54%		Same Voting System - ES&S
St. Lucie	0.82%	0.55%		Same Voting System - Diebold
Sumter	3.35%	1.33%		

Change from November 2000 to November 2002 in Overvote, Undervote and Invalid Write-in Percentage (continued)

County	Nov 2000 Presidential Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid Write-in %	Nov 2002 Gov/Lt Gov Overvotes, Undervotes & Invalid %	Increase in % from 2000 to 2002	Comments
Suwannee	5.55%	0.64%		
Taylor	8.16%	0.83%		
Union	6.32%	1.20%		
Volusia	0.27%	0.45%	Increase	Same Voting System - Diebold
Wakulla	4.68%	0.69%		
Walton	1.18%	0.57%		Same Voting System - Diebold
Washington	3.94%	2.37%		Same Voting System - ES&S
	-----	-----		
Statewide	2.93 %	0.86 %		
	-----	-----		

EXHIBIT 7

United States Congressional Contests, Overvotes and Undervotes Voting Systems Order 2002 General Election

County	Voting System Vendor	Type	U.S. Congress District	U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Total	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Total vs. Turnout	U.S. Rep Total by County
Alachua	Diebold	M	District 3	50	0	327	0	377						
Alachua	Diebold	M	District 6	306	1	2,260	0	2,567						
			Sub-Total	356	1	2,587	0	2,944	0.51%	0.00%	3.67%	0.00%	4.16%	2,944
Brevard	Diebold	M	District 15	293	1	2,651	6	2,951						
Brevard	Diebold	M	District 24	151	0	484	0	635						
			Sub-Total	444	1	3,135	6	3,586	0.23%	0.00%	1.62%	0.00%	1.86%	3,586
Calhoun	Diebold	M	District 2	15	3	100	4	122	0.35%	0.07%	2.32%	0.09%	2.84%	122
Citrus	Diebold	M	District 5	143	2	622	7	774	0.27%	0.00%	1.17%	0.01%	1.46%	774
Columbia	Diebold	M	District 4	497	1	3,655	0	4,153	3.02%	0.01%	22.21%	0.00%	25.24%	4,153
DeSoto	Diebold	M	District 13	0	0	136	1	137	0.00%	0.00%	1.87%	0.01%	1.88%	137
Dixie	Diebold	M	District 2	15	0	98	0	113	0.37%	0.00%	2.40%	0.00%	2.77%	113
Duval	Diebold	M	District 3	70	0	543	2	615						
Duval	Diebold	M	District 4	2,099	0	19,577	2	21,678						
Duval	Diebold	M	District 6	95	0	833	0	928						
			Sub-Total	2,264	0	20,953	4	23,221	0.93%	0.00%	8.59%	0.00%	9.52%	23,221
Flagler	Diebold	M	District 7	65	1	361	0	427	0.25%	0.00%	1.40%	0.00%	1.65%	427
Gilchrist	Diebold	M	District 6	30	0	165	0	195	0.59%	0.00%	3.22%	0.00%	3.81%	195
Glades	Diebold	M	District 16	29	0	125	0	154	0.98%	0.00%	4.21%	0.00%	5.19%	154
Hardee	Diebold	M	District 13	13	0	137	0	150	0.24%	0.00%	2.53%	0.00%	2.77%	150
Hernando	Diebold	M	District 5	97	2	945	10	1,054	0.17%	0.00%	1.63%	0.02%	1.82%	1,054
Jefferson	Diebold	M	District 2	5	0	34	0	39						
Jefferson	Diebold	M	District 4	229	0	858	0	1,087						
			Sub-Total	234	0	892	0	1,126	4.03%	0.00%	15.36%	0.00%	19.39%	1,126

**United States Congressional Contests, Overvotes and Undervotes Voting Systems Order
2002 General Election (continued)**

County	Voting System Vendor	Type	U.S. Congress District	U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Total	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Total vs. Turnout	U.S. Rep Total by County
Leon	Diebold	M	District 2	443	1	1,569	0	2,013						
Leon	Diebold	M	District 4	354	0	1,749	0	2,103						
			Sub-Total	804	1	3,310	0	4,116	0.84%	0.00%	3.51%	0.00%	4.35%	4,116
Levy	Diebold	M	District 5	16	0	190	1	207						
Levy	Diebold	M	District 6	6	0	86	0	92						
			Sub-Total	22	0	276	1	299	0.19%	0.00%	2.44%	0.01%	2.65%	299
Madison	Diebold	M	District 4	362	0	1,773	0	2,135	6.11%	0.00%	29.91%	0.00%	36.02%	2,135
Manatee	Diebold	M	District 13	177	2	1,339	14	1,532	0.17%	0.00%	1.32%	0.01%	1.51%	1,532
Monroe	Diebold	M	District 18	227	6	778	2	1,013						
Monroe	Diebold	M	District 25	1	0	0	0	1						
			Sub-Total	228	6	778	2	1,014	0.88%	0.02%	3.01%	0.01%	3.93%	1,014
Okaloosa	Diebold	M	District 1	745	0	236	0	981						
Okaloosa	Diebold	M	District 2	178	0	53	0	231						
			Sub-Total	923	0	289	0	1,212	1.62%	0.00%	0.51%	0.00%	2.13%	1,212
Okeechobee	Diebold	M	District 16	104	0	344	0	448	1.20%	0.00%	3.98%	0.00%	5.19%	448
Osceola	Diebold	M	District 8	2	0	40	0	42						
Osceola	Diebold	M	District 15	144	0	1,570	0	1,714						
			Sub-Total	146	0	1,610	0	1,756	0.30%	0.00%	3.35%	0.00%	3.65%	1,756
Polk	Diebold	M	District 5	73	1	501	1	576						
Polk	Diebold	M	District 15	15	0	199	0	214						
			Sub-Total	88	1	700	1	790	0.06%	0.00%	0.49%	0.00%	0.55%	790
Putnam	Diebold	M	District 3	28	0	171	1	200						
Putnam	Diebold	M	District 7	18	0	230	0	248						
			Sub-Total	46	0	401	1	448	0.20%	0.00%	1.79%	0.00%	2.00%	448

**United States Congressional Contests, Overvotes and Undervotes Voting Systems Order
2002 General Election (continued)**

County	Voting System Vendor	Type	U.S. Congress District	U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Total	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Total vs. Turnout	U.S. Rep Total by County
Seminole	Diebold	M	District 3	25	2	134	0	161						
Seminole	Diebold	M	District 7	100	8	1,030	1	1,139						
Seminole	Diebold	M	District 24	170	5	1,450	0	1,625						
			Sub-Total	295	15	2,614	1	2,925	0.25%	0.01%	2.18%	0.00%	2.44%	2,925
St. Lucie	Diebold	M	District 16	584	0	2316	0	2,900						
St. Lucie	Diebold	M	District 23	30	1	143	0	174						
			Sub-Total	614	1	2,459	0	3,074	0.91%	0.00%	3.63%	0.00%	4.53%	3,074
Taylor	Diebold	M	District 2	14	0	69	0	83	0.23%	0.00%	1.14%	0.00%	1.37%	83
Volusia	Diebold	M	District 3	21	0	84	0	105						
Volusia	Diebold	M	District 7	186	1	1,247	1	1,435						
Volusia	Diebold	M	District 24	274	0	1,395	0	1,669						
			Sub-Total	481	1	2,726	1	3,209	0.30%	0.00%	1.71%	0.00%	2.01%	3,209
Wakulla	Diebold	M	District 2	35	0	117	0	152	0.41%	0.00%	1.37%	0.00%	1.78%	152
Walton	Diebold	M	District 1	12	0	417	1	430						
Walton	Diebold	M	District 2	39	0	130	0	169						
			Sub-Total	51	0	547	1	599	0.32%	0.00%	3.48%	0.01%	3.82%	599
				-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Diebold Accuvote Total				8,585	38	53,271	54	61,948	0.54%	0.00%	3.34%	0.00%	3.89%	61,948
				-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

**United States Congressional Contests, Overvotes and Undervotes Voting Systems Order
2002 General Election (continued)**

County	Voting System Vendor	Type	U.S. Congress District	U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Total	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Total vs. Turnout	U.S. Rep Total by County
Bay	ES&S	M	District 2	293	2	842	15	1,152	0.60%	0.00%	1.71%	0.03%	2.34%	1,152
Bradford	ES&S	M	District 6	39	1	282	2	324	0.49%	0.01%	3.57%	0.03%	4.10%	324
Franklin	ES&S	M	District 2	38	0	75	0	113	0.99%	0.00%	1.95%	0.00%	2.93%	113
Gadsden	ES&S	M	District 2	49	0	243	3	295	0.32%	0.00%	1.57%	0.02%	1.91%	295
Gulf	ES&S	M	District 2	61	0	104	2	167	1.11%	0.00%	1.89%	0.04%	3.03%	167
Hamilton	ES&S	M	District 4	246	0	961	0	1,207	7.29%	0.00%	28.47%	0.00%	35.76%	1,207
Hendry	ES&S	M	District 16	58	0	250	1	309						
Hendry	ES&S	M	District 23	3	0	48	0	51						
			Sub-Total	61	0	298	1	360	0.95%	0.00%	4.63%	0.02%	5.59%	360
Highlands	ES&S	M	District 16	137	1	1,831	4	1,973	0.45%	0.00%	6.05%	0.01%	6.52%	1,973
Jackson	ES&S	M	District 2	90	0	422	2	514	0.60%	0.00%	2.81%	0.01%	3.42%	514
Lafayette	ES&S	M	District 2	28	0	71	0	99	1.07%	0.00%	2.71%	0.00%	3.78%	99
Liberty	ES&S	M	District 2	10	0	66	0	76	0.41%	0.00%	2.71%	0.00%	3.12%	76
Marion	ES&S	M	District 3	10	2	79	0	91						
Marion	ES&S	M	District 5	6	0	104	1	111						
Marion	ES&S	M	District 6	275	0	2,077	8	2,360						
Marion	ES&S	M	District 8	104	0	888	1	993						
			Sub-Total	395	2	3,148	10	3,555	0.41%	0.00%	3.29%	0.01%	3.72%	3,555
Suwannee	ES&S	M	District 2	58	0	261	0	319	0.52%	0.00%	2.34%	0.00%	2.86%	319
Union	ES&S	M	District 4	191	0	721	0	912	5.46%	0.00%	20.63%	0.00%	26.09%	912
				-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
ES&S M100 Total				1,696	6	9,325	39	11,066	0.67%	0.00%	3.69%	0.02%	4.38%	11,066
				-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

**United States Congressional Contests, Overvotes and Undervotes Voting Systems Order
2002 General Election (continued)**

County	Voting System Vendor	Type	U.S. Congress District	U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Total	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Total vs. Turnout	U.S. Rep Total by County
Clay	ES&S	M	District 3	12	0	41	0	53						
Clay	ES&S	M	District 6	97	0	889	0	986						
			Sub-Total	109	0	930	0	1,039	0.52%	0.00%	3.75%	0.00%	2.04%	1,039
Escambia	ES&S	M	District 1	265	1	1,584	2	1,852	0.28%	0.00%	1.70%	0.00%	1.99%	1,852
Holmes	ES&S	M	District 1	20	0	328	0	348	0.35%	0.00%	5.78%	0.00%	6.13%	348
Orange	ES&S	M	District 3	140	40	841	3	1,024						
Orange	ES&S	M	District 7	23	0	145	0	168						
Orange	ES&S	M	District 8	704	48	4,745	9	5,506						
Orange	ES&S	M	District 24	233	18	2,009	1	2,261						
			Sub-Total	1,100	106	7,740	13	8,959	0.45%	0.04%	3.20%	0.01%	3.70%	8,959
Santa Rosa	ES&S	M	District 1	75	0	489	3	567	0.17%	0.00%	1.11%	0.01%	1.29%	567
St. Johns	ES&S	M	District 7	184	1	785	2	972	0.33%	0.00%	1.40%	0.00%	1.73%	972
Washington	ES&S	M	District 1	192	0	371	0	563	2.74%	0.00%	5.29%	0.00%	8.02%	563
				-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
ES&S Optech Total				1,945	108	12,227	20	14,300	0.39%	0.02%	2.45%	0.00%	2.87%	14,300
				-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Baker	Sequoia	M	District 4	205	1	1,424	0	1,630	3.10%	0.02%	21.54%	0.00%	24.66%	1,630
				-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Sequoia Optech Total				205	1	1,424	0	1,630	3.10%	0.02%	21.54%	0.00%	24.66%	1,630
				-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

**United States Congressional Contests, Overvotes and Undervotes Voting Systems Order
2002 General Election (continued)**

County	Voting System Vendor	Type	U.S. Congress District	U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Total	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Total vs. Turnout	U.S. Rep Total by County
Broward	ES&S	D	District 17	702	1	10,101	0	10,804						
Broward	ES&S	D	District 19	193	3	4,513	0	4,709						
Broward	ES&S	D	District 22	153	3	2,125	0	2,281						
Broward	ES&S	D	District 23	229	1	4,011	0	4,241						
			Sub-Total	1,277	8	20,750	0	22,035	0.29%	0.00%	4.67%	0.00%	4.96%	22,035
Charlotte	ES&S	D	District 13	23	0	48	0	71						
Charlotte	ES&S	D	District 16	518	0	998	0	1,516						
			Sub-Total	541	0	1,046	0	1,587	0.89%	0.00%	1.73%	0.00%	2.62%	1,587
Collier	ES&S	D	District 25	75	0	700	0	775	0.09%	0.00%	0.83%	0.00%	0.92%	775
Miami-Dade	ES&S	D	District 17	3,347	0	13,227	0	16,574						
Miami-Dade	ES&S	D	District 18	1,089	1	5,117	0	6,207						
Miami-Dade	ES&S	D	District 24	690	1	3,383	0	4,074						
			Sub-Total	5,126	2	21,727	0	26,855	1.01%	0.00%	4.28%	0.00%	5.28%	26,855
Lake	ES&S	D	District 3	21	0	278	0	299						
Lake	ES&S	D	District 5	132	2	1,355	0	1,489						
Lake	ES&S	D	District 6	94	0	1,238	0	1,332						
Lake	ES&S	D	District 8	115	0	1,407	0	1,522						
				362	2	4,278	0	4,642	0.44%	0.00%	5.19%	0.00%	5.63%	4,642
Martin	ES&S	D	District 16	512	0	2,706	0	3,218						
Martin	ES&S	D	District 24	0	0	24	0	24						3,242
			Sub-Total	512	0	2,730	0	3,242	0.95%	0.00%	5.06%	0.00%	6.00%	
Nassau	ES&S	D	District 4	265	0	4,819	0	5,084	1.24%	0.00%	22.54%	0.00%	23.78%	5,084
Pasco	ES&S	D	District 5	201	1	2,722	0	2,924						
Pasco	ES&S	D	District 9	130	0	1,951	0	2,081						
			Sub-Total	331	1	4,673	0	5,005	0.25%	0.00%	3.56%	0.00%	3.81%	5,005

**United States Congressional Contests, Overvotes and Undervotes Voting Systems Order
2002 General Election (continued)**

County	Voting System Vendor	Type	U.S. Congress District	U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	U.S. Rep Total	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Absentee Ballots	% U.S. Rep Undervotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Overvotes Precinct Ballots	% U.S. Rep Total vs. Turnout	U.S. Rep Total by County
Sarasota	ES&S	D	District 13	384	0	2,737	0	3,121	0.27%	0.00%	1.94%	0.00%	2.21%	3,121
Sumter	ES&S	D	District 5	45	0	768	0	813	0.20%	0.00%	3.34%	0.00%	3.53%	813
ES&S iVotronic Total (See Note 2)				8,918	13	64,228	0	73,159	0.52%	0.00%	3.75%	0.00%	4.27%	21
Hillsborough (See Note 3)	Sequoia	D	District 9	0	0	0	0	3,936	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.25%	3,936
Indian River	Sequoia	D	District 15	119	1	1,084	0	1,204	0.27%	0.00%	2.42%	0.00%	2.69%	1,204
Palm Beach	Sequoia	D	District 16	0	0	0	0	0						
Palm Beach	Sequoia	D	District 19	0	0	0	0	0						
Palm Beach	Sequoia	D	District 22	0	0	0	0	0						
Palm Beach (See Note 4)	Sequoia	D	District 23	0	0	0	0	0						
			Sub-Total	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0
Pinellas	Sequoia	D	District 9	276	3	3,112	0	3,391	0.08%	0.00%	0.92%	0.00%	1.00%	3,391
Sequoia EDGE Total (See Notes 2, 3, and 4)				395	4	4,196	0	8,531	0.04%	0.00%	0.39%	0.00%	0.79%	8,531
Grand Total (See Notes 2, 3, and 4)				21,744	170	144,671	113	170,634	0.42%	0.00%	2.81%	0.00%	3.32%	170,634

- Notes:**
1. Due to rounding, individual percentages may not add exactly to the summary percentages.
 2. Absentee Ballot Undervotes in the ES&S iVotronic and Sequoia EDGE touch screen counties include results from both marksense absentee ballots and voting prior to election day on touch screen voting terminals.
 3. Hillsborough County was not able to provide Congressional breakout information since their voting system lacked reports for breaking out absentees, provisionals, overvotes and undervotes by Congressional District and by split precinct. Hillsborough County was able to determine that they had 2 overvotes (from marksense ballots) and a total number of 3,934 undervotes (absentee and precinct combined) in its single United States Congressional District 9 contest. The Hillsborough County undervote and overvote totals of 3,936 are included in the Hillsborough County totals, the Sequoia EDGE totals and the Grand Totals. It is NOT incorporated into the undervote and overvote breakout numbers and percentages.
 4. Palm Beach County was not able to provide Congressional breakout information for their four United States Congressional Districts since their voting system lacked reports for breaking out absentees, provisionals, overvotes and undervotes by Congressional District and by split precinct.

