

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



FROM: County Executive Office

SUBMITTAL DATE:
April 9, 2009

SUBJECT: Citizens' Review of November 2008 Election

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

- 1) receive and file the attached report titled "Missing Pieces," and
- 2) direct the Registrar of Voters to respond to this report's recommendations in her follow-up report to the recent Operational Review of the November 2008 Election.

BACKGROUND:

The attached report was submitted to the County Executive Office by the local organization Save R Vote. Founder Tom Courbat asked that it be included for discussion during the afternoon agenda of the April 14 Board meeting. Mr. Courbat was involved in the recent Operational Review as an independent reviewer.

The report contains 20 recommendations, many of which are already being implemented by the Registrar of Voters. The Registrar is scheduled to report back on the recommendations contained in the Operational Review by September 1, 2009, and can easily respond to this report at the same time.

Kathryn Field, Deputy County Executive Officer

FINANCIAL DATA	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$ 0	In Current Year Budget:	no
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ 0	Budget Adjustment:	no
	Annual Net County Cost:	\$ 0	For Fiscal Year:	

SOURCE OF FUNDS:	Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Requires 4/5 Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

BY:
Gary M. Christmas

County Executive Office Signature

Dept't Recomm.: Consent Policy
Per Exec. Ofc.: Consent Policy

Prev. Agn. Ref.: 16.3 of 3/3/09

District: all

Agenda Number:

16.6

Departmental Concurrence

MISSING PIECES

A Citizens' Review of the November 2008 Presidential Election
in Riverside County, California

PRESENTED ON APRIL 14, 2009
To

The Riverside County, CA
Board of Supervisors



PREPARED BY
SAVE R VOTE*
WWW.SAVERVOTE.COM

A Project of **Citizens for Democracy**

**A nonpartisan organization dedicated to enhancing the democratic process, working for an effective, open government that is committed to the common good by
“Putting the Public back into the Public’s Business”**

FMI Contact Tom Courbat, Founder @ tom68-69korea@thecourbats.com or 951-677-6451

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“Past performance is the best indicator of future performance” – Executive Recruiting principle.

SAVE R VOTE (SRV) has issued five Election Observer Reports beginning with the June 6, 2006 Primary Election to the June 3, 2008 Primary Election. Every report has focused on operations related to the following three broad areas of public interest/concern:

1. Security (including Chain-of-Custody)
2. Transparency
3. Accountability/accuracy/auditability

In every report, we have indicated that the vast majority of rank and file ROV employees and the thousands of volunteer precinct workers are hard working, dedicated, reliable individuals whose only failing, if one is to call it that, is that they were not adequately trained. There’s a popular saying in the education field: “If the student failed to learn, the teacher failed to teach.” Consistently every review of election systems in Riverside or throughout the state has cited lack of adequate training as one of the top problems.

In every past SRV report, we identified serious breaches in all three of the categories listed above and in training. In most instances, *some* changes resulted from our findings and recommendations, but many deficiencies remained and were identified repeatedly in subsequent reports. Many, if not most of our previous findings and recommendations are confirmed by the very recent Best, Best & Krieger review commissioned by the Board and presented on March 3, 2009.

SAVE R VOTE’s findings and recommendations appear in a table beginning on page 6.

We commend the Board of Supervisors for taking two very important steps in the last two years. The first step was the appointment of a “Blue Ribbon” Election Review Committee (ERC) in December 2006. In July 2007 the ERC issued a final report containing 17 recommendations including converting immediately to a hybrid system driven primarily by a paper ballot process, and hiring an outside firm to review security procedures of the Registrar of Voters (ROV). The cover letter from Committee Chair Kay Cenicerros stated “Widely used and lauded just a few years ago, concerns with electronic voting, including its 3% error rate, have led to extensive discussion. These issues are of concern to our committee and to county voters, many of whom are concerned.”

In August 2007, Secretary of State Debra Bowen issued a “Top to Bottom Review” of findings from a team of top computer scientists she commissioned to review the security of electronic voting systems. The report on the Sequoia system stated, “The threat model ...assumes two classes of threats: insiders and outsiders... Our testing identified a number of security issues that are of great concern...we were able to bypass both the physical and the software security protections of the Sequoia system.” As a result, the Secretary decertified the entire Sequoia System including the voting machines, the results cartridges, the Optech 400C scanners and the WinEDS Central Tabulator software. The Sequoia

System was then immediately re-certified if and only if 41 Conditions of Certification were continuously met. **Those conditions of certification have not been continuously met**, as documented by Best, Best and Krieger and by this and previous SAVE R VOTE reports.

The second step the Board took was to engage the services of Best, Best and Krieger (BB&K) on October 7, 2008 to “...initiate an **operational review** of the ROV’s election process for the November 4, 2008 Consolidated General Election...and it was agreed that Mr. Tom Courbat would act as an ‘independent reviewer to the Registrar of Voters’ operational review’.” The Board’s decision to approve this election operation process review came on the heels of a September 16, 2008 report to the Board entitled “Broken Links” detailing SRV observations of significant security and transparency concerns and containing recommendations related to the June 2008 Primary Election and future elections.

The BB&K report was presented to the Board on March 3, 2009 and contained 82 findings and 36 recommendations. Former District Attorney Grover Trask headed up a 36-member team that reviewed operations before, during and after the Election. While it was not termed an audit, nor did the Board or CEO request an audit per se, it was a very thorough “Operational, Security & Accountability Review of the November 4, 2008 Riverside County Election & Ballot Process” [The BB&K Review]. As stated on page 30 of the BB&K Review, “The Audit Team did not conduct a forensic audit. With respect to transparency of the ballot reconciliation process and other canvassing processes, the specific adequacy of the procedures cannot be determined without a forensic audit.”

In other words, according to the 500+ page BB&K review, a true ***forensic audit*** is needed to determine if the ROV is properly completing a very critical aspect of the electoral process – the canvass – a highly complex and intensive post-Election process ***to verify and validate the election results***. BB&K was not asked to validate the election results.

There is a second critical area that was not formally within the scope of the BB&K Review. No review was conducted of audit and event logs and databases from the central tabulator, the computer-driven ballot scanners, and the voting machines (aka Direct Recording Electronic or DREs). ***Simply put, the logs reveal what processes are occurring before, during and after the processing of the voter’s ballots, and can reveal whether tampering has occurred.*** This is true whether the ballot is paper and processed through the computer-programmed scanners or electronic and processed through the DREs and ultimately through the Central Tabulator. The scope of the review did not specify that BB&K should attempt such a review or to determine if viruses or malicious or innocuous code had been inserted anywhere throughout the voting system.

THE CASE FOR CONTINUOUS CLOSE SCRUTINY OF ELECTION OPERATIONS

The importance of such a review cannot be overstated. In Pima County, AZ after a court order was issued to release the audit/event logs and databases from the May 16, 2006 Election, reviewers found significant anomalies in the vote count related to a \$2 billion RTA bond issue. Four similar bond measures had failed previously. The audit logs revealed a high likelihood that elections officials had changed the vote data on 90 voting machines’ results cartridges and illegally printed out the absentee voter results as they came in prior to the election - violating the law and the sacred trust placed in them to keep the results secret until after the polls closed on Election Day. Further investigation

revealed that this practice had likely been going on since 2004 until officials were confronted about it in December 2006. <http://www.bradblog.com/?p=6160>

On December 20, 2006, former Monterey County Registrar of Voters Tony Anchundo pleaded “no contest” to 43 criminal counts, including charges of forgery, misapplication of funds, embezzlement, falsification of accounts, and grand theft of nearly \$80,000 of county money. <http://www.bradblog.com/?p=3937>

Last month, in Clay County, Kentucky five Clay County officials, including the circuit court judge, the county clerk, and election officers were arrested after they were indicted on federal charges accusing them of using corrupt tactics to obtain political power and personal gain. http://www.lex18.com/Global/story.asp?S=10037216&nav=menu203_2

The 10-count indictment, unsealed on March 19th, accused the defendants of a conspiracy from March 2002 until November 2006 that violated the Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO). RICO is a federal statute that prosecutors use to combat organized crime. The defendants were also indicted for extortion, mail fraud, obstruction of justice, conspiracy to injure voters' rights and conspiracy to commit voter fraud. <http://www.bradblog.com/?p=7001>

According to the indictment, these alleged criminal actions affected the outcome of federal, local, and state primary and general elections in 2002, 2004, and 2006.

The purpose of informing your Board of these recent examples of elections operations gone very array is to emphasize that “it can happen here”, and to suggest mitigation efforts that make it highly unlikely anything of this type will happen on your watch.

SAVE R VOTE is in no way suggesting that illegal activities are occurring in the Riverside County ROV office. However, there are insufficient controls and oversight to reveal breaches. The BB&K team reported that “...gaps in the existing security and chain of custody could eventually lead to serious threats to the integrity of the County’s election system.” Eventually could be 10 years from now, or it could be 10 days from now. ***SAVE R VOTE recommends a forensic audit of the canvass process and a computer systems audit by appropriate experts at the soonest possible time and recommends revenue enhancements/cost reductions to provide the financial resources.***

One reason there is a belief the election system is working correctly is because no independent outside forensic experts have analyzed the post-election verification system or the logs and databases of the ROV. We have witnessed the collapse of the financial systems in the U.S. partly due to a lack of critical outside auditing, allowing unsafe practices to eventually undermine the entire system.

Election systems are very vulnerable to tampering given the secretive nature of the private corporations that produce the proprietary software and hardware and the lack of independent scrutiny of the system. Federal and state testing of the systems is so infrequent and the ability of the voting systems companies or insiders to make uncertified modifications so great, that certifications issued years ago cannot be relied upon to ensure the integrity of the system today. ***The final report of the Baker/Carter Election Reform Commission contained a stark warning: “There is no reason to trust insiders in the election industry any more than in other industries.”*** That is not to say that most election

officials and voting systems employees are not trustworthy, but no where is the phrase “Trust, but verify” more appropriate than in our electoral system

The FAA requires that emergency parachutes be unpacked, inspected and repacked at least annually. But our voting systems only go before federal and state authorities every five or more years. If local authorities don’t take interim precautionary measures, election results could be consistently compromised and never detected.

We recognize the severe financial constraints the county is under but citizens are entitled to know that the local election system has been scrutinized by *independent outside experts* on a regular basis and found to be secure from tampering. Right now there is no independent outside verification that a comprehensive system is in place to detect a well-orchestrated attack that would alter election results. Ignorance is not bliss, it is inviting disaster.’

Recommendations contained in this report could easily enhance revenues and reduce costs of operation of the ROV office in order to implement the recommendations to engage an independent outside forensic audit and computer system security audit. We are aware that the County Information Security Office has been reviewing security elements of the ROV operations, but it is always beneficial to have a totally unbiased and independent review.

SAVE R VOTE engaged 120 volunteers to monitor the November election process. The effort was led by former Riverside County Finance Director Tom Courbat who has an MBA in financial management and over 25 years of local government experience. Others on the team include former LA, San Diego and King County Washington government officials. One member of the team holds a PhD in economics.

Each person donated significant time and effort to the project at their own expense. Over 100 precincts were monitored on Election Day, amounting to far over a 10% sampling. Over 20,000 documents were examined by the team and associates over a period of five months. The post-election document review is believed to be the most comprehensive forensic review ever performed on a single county election system.

The major findings and recommendations are contained in the table on the following pages.

SAVE R VOTE – Findings and Recommendations

#	Findings	Recommendation
1	There is no independent verification of the validity of election results	Engage a forensic audit of the canvass (internal verification) to validate election results and establish ongoing verification
2	There is no independent review of the computerized election system that would reveal false results	Engage an outside independent computer systems audit to assess threat levels and ensure adequate controls are in place to detect tampering at all vulnerable points
3	The cost of performing the 100% tally of the e-votes in February, June and November 2008 elections could approach \$750,000	Sequoia Systems is required to reimburse the county as a condition of the certification of the system. Aggressively pursue full reimbursement for all three elections and future elections
4	The ongoing costs & vulnerability of the electronic voting system far exceed the costs & security of a full paper-ballot system. In November, 89% of the ballots cast were on paper	Transition back to a full paper ballot system utilizing DIOS (Digital Imaging Optical Scan) imaging scanners as recommended by expert Harri Hursti in 2007.
5	The Transparency Project in Humboldt County uses Ballot Browser (BB) & scans all ballots and posts the images to the Internet. Citizen reviewers identified a loss of 197 ballots on the certified count and a flaw in the E-Voting software.	Seek SOS approval to implement the Ballot Browser (BB) program. It is scalable to large counties & the results provide complete transparency to citizens of the ballot tabulation process. It gives citizens a higher confidence level when they can audit the results.
6	Failure to comply with at least 8 Conditions of Certification put the County at risk of the entire Sequoia System being decertified.	Direct the ROV to immediately comply with all Conditions of Certification and to report what actions she is taking to comply.
7	The ROV has consistently refused to release audit and event logs and databases (no voter identification) for public scrutiny. The Pima County experience illustrates the importance of making these public documents available as a fraud deterrent. Monterey County recently released similar documents after careful consideration.	Direct County Counsel to review the concept that these reports are created by a governmental body conducting the public's business (even though that body is using a proprietary system); they don't reveal anything proprietary (see Gov. Code 6253.9(c)); and they don't reveal anything that would jeopardize the security of a voting system (ibid.). On the contrary, close examination and analysis of audit logs might reveal breaches in or attempts to breach security.
8	Compliance with various legal and regulatory requirements continues to be a problem. Examples include not posting ballot counts at precincts,	Direct the ROV to be proactive in complying with all legal and regulatory requirements, whether or not she agrees with those requirements.

	extensive delays in releasing public documents (120 days) and refusal to provide a viewable public monitor of the central tabulator. These actions project a mindset that it is acceptable to selectively comply or delay compliance; they also create the impression that the ROV has something to hide.	
9	During the 100% tally of e-votes the ROV moved the process from a public area to a non-public area and tally teams were reduced from a mandatory size of 4 to half that size, rendering the process non-compliant. Initially observers were precluded from directly viewing and hearing the process but upon complaint, these problems were resolved. State requirements specify tally processes to be conducted in full public view at all times.	Direct the ROV to proactively pursue a policy and practice of full transparency and to conduct the tally processes with the required number of team members. Two individuals cannot ensure non-collusion in the tally (vote verification) process. The requirement of four is to ensure that the person reading off the votes is reading them properly and that the 2 individuals marking the tally sheets are marking them as called.
10	It appears that the ROV issued Policy A-25 in January 2009 retroactively (to the November election) imposing a prohibition on releasing electronic documents in their original format as required by law. ROV staff wrote that this was also countywide policy.	Investigate to determine if this policy was issued retroactively and determine if it conflicts with Government Code Section 6253.9(a) that requires the release of documents in original electronic format. Inquiry to the Clerk of the Board indicated no such countywide policy exists.
11	SRV made an inquiry regarding an increase of nearly 20,000 counted ballots between spreadsheets received on December 11 th and December 17 th , both after the December 2 nd certification. The ROV indicated this increase was because “outstacked ballots” had been added to the count and that the addition was made prior to certification. Documentation of the number of outstacked ballots was requested but not responded to by report deadline.	Direct the CEO to investigate the addition of the 20,000 counted ballots and to determine if the explanation is supported by documentation and direct that the documentation be made public at the earliest possible date. This is a prime example of the difficulty of verifying the reconciliation of the ballots on an independent basis.
12	The ROV withheld what is the most significant of all election-related documents, the unlocked <i>electronic</i> Ballot Reconciliation spreadsheet, was withheld until one day before this report was due to the Board. By doing so, the ROV severely limited	The Board can assist in ensuring the entire election process is transparent by directing the ROV to respond timely to California Public Records Act (CPRA) requests. In this case, 120 days elapsed before the ROV released this document. The ROV’s refusal to release in a timely

	time for review. The spreadsheet contained new information not previously revealed including the number of provisional ballots counted, an item necessary to reconcile the total ballot counts.	manner was not in compliance with the CPRA.
13	On two occasions, December 16 th and March 5 th , the audit firm and SAVE R VOTE respectively requested the ballot reconciliation spreadsheet with <u>totals</u> in each of 30+ columns that were 721 lines long (corresponding to the number of precincts). Since the ROV refused to provide the spreadsheet in anything but a “locked” format, validation of the totals the ROV provided was labor (cost) intensive and not performed. When SRV did run totals on April 7 th it was discovered that the totals were wrong.	Direct the ROV to provide documents requested under CPRA in the legally required electronic format. Validating data in an electronic spreadsheet can be done in a matter of seconds when provided in an unlocked format. Provision of the data in printed format (17 pages long) or PDF or otherwise locked format requires hours of unnecessary and potentially error-prone manual tallying, in this case, of up to 20,000 data elements. Withholding data is contrary to GC 6253.1(a) requiring the agency to “assist” the public in obtaining the requested information and creates the impression that the ROV has something to hide.
14	The ROV has responded to the requirement that all voting units be stored in locked or secure locations once delivered to precincts by stating “locked storage...presents challenges ...if the ‘holder of the key’ cannot be found...” Such ‘challenges’ should have a ‘Plan B’ solution as opposed to reluctance to seek locked storage.	Direct the ROV to proactively initiate ‘Plan B’ approaches so there is a way to release machines from secure storage on Election Eve/Election Day. Securing the machines from tampering is critical to ensuring a credible election outcome.
15	SAVE R VOTE was able to verify that roughly 1/3 of the precinct postings were completed and were accurate. There is a long history of reluctance/refusal by the ROV to comply with precinct posting requirements. This is a critical “check and balance” against the computer generated numbers that is lost without compliance.	Direct the ROV to review the precinct information and identify those precincts where no or inaccurate information was posted. Focus enhanced training on those precinct inspectors if they return in that capacity in future elections. Emphasize strongly to new precinct workers how critical this is to the validation process.
16	The Ballot Processing Audit Form (BPAF) is not a useable tool in any useful way for a two-card ballot.	Develop a process to batch the two cards separately from each other to achieve accurate counts, and develop a BPAF to accurately account for a two-card ballot election.
16a	There is no central capture of anomaly data from each and every batch to compare and perform audit	Such central capture and analysis of precinct to precinct anomaly data should begin immediately.

	functions upon.	
17	The precinct sizes are substantially oversize for good election management, disaster recovery, and demographic purposes in general. Election Code Section 12223 establishes a maximum of 1,000 registered voters per precinct as of 88 days prior to elections. After adjusting for voter registration surges up to E-15, the last day to register, it appears that as many as 211 precincts are too large, with 149 “critical”, and 35 in “crisis”. Two precincts had over 3,000 registered voters. See spreadsheet for details.	Hold on any precinct adjustments, except those necessary to comply with boundary changes and to comply with state law. Reduce precinct sizes substantially when re-drawing boundaries at decennial redistricting in 2011. SRV understands that the ROV intends to significantly reduce the number of precincts for the May 19, 2009 election due to anticipate lower turnout. It should be noted that this “rejiggering” of precincts will likely cause considerable confusion for voters who are used to going to the same precinct election after election.
18	Meaningful observation of canvass activities has improved significantly but is still inconsistent from election to election and from tally to tally.	The BB&K report recommends that “The ROV adopt rules and procedures that will ensure that the public can <u>at all times meaningfully observe</u> the process for both the 1% and 10% tally.” – emphasis by BB&K in 12/18/08 memorandum.
19	During the 1% and 10% tallies – SRV observed erasures being made on tally sheets (contrary to law) and an absence of supervisors’ recording of ongoing issues regarding balancing problems as required by law. When SRV asked to see the supervisors’ notations of issues raised and resolved, they were informed no such documents were being maintained.	There should never be erasures on tally sheets – it defeats the purpose of independent tallying/verification of election results. Forensic examination revealed examples of erasures and changing of totals. This practice should be stopped immediately and supervisors should record all issues related to the tallies on “event sheets” or similar documents to ensure a clear trail of how tally problems were addressed and resolved.
20	SRV reviewed more than 300 Election Officer Comment Sheets wherein precinct workers and supervisors provided their perspective on what the key issues were at the polls. A summary of key findings is attached at page 12.	The ROV routinely reviews these reports and implements those suggestions that are feasible. We encourage the ROV to continue this important practice.

CONCLUSIONS

SAVE R VOTE continues to provide citizen-based real-time and forensic monitoring and review of ROV operations. Unfortunately the more we look, the more issues we find that impact on the security, transparency, and accuracy/accountability/auditability of operations

in Riverside County. It is our sincere hope that the combination of recommendations from BB&K and SAVE R VOTE will be implemented in a professional and meaningful manner.

We regret that the process is as confrontational as it is. We recognize that no one appreciates being put under a microscope, but the importance of the integrity of the electoral process demands a high degree of citizen oversight. The volunteer citizen observers bring a level of insight to the ROV and the Board and the citizens of Riverside County that cannot be duplicated at any price. We serve willingly with the sole goal of achieving secure, accurate, and transparent elections for the citizens of Riverside County.

Relevant documents follow including a photo illustrating how the computer housed in a scanner cabinet can appear to be fully secured but actually unlocked and very unsecure. Hence the need to “trust, but verify”.

We look forward to presenting our findings to the Board on Tuesday, April 14th at 1:30.

SECURITY: When “sealed” *doesn’t* mean secured (or locked)



Seals like this are placed over all keyholes to ensure no one can access the cabinet of the high-speed Sequoia 400-C Optech Scanner, used to count the ballots. Inside the “locked” cabinet is the computer or “brains” of the unit, where programming changes can be made (altered) to instruct the scanner to count every 10th vote for Bob as a vote for Roger, for example. Thus it is critical that the seal be placed over a *locked* access point.



During a test of the security and operational integrity of the unit, *it was discovered that the cabinet was not locked, yet the seal gave the appearance that it was.* In this example, a person could have accessed the computer inside, made the type of change mentioned above, and re-secured the unit. In theory, the tape (seal) would have shown the word “Opened” or a series of dots. However, until SAVE R VOTE questioned the existence of a log regarding replacement seals, no recordation of such information was taking place. The log was implemented right after SAVE R VOTE asked to see the log. Without logs, anyone with access can do anything with impunity if not caught.

After witnessing this security gaffe, SAVE R VOTE asked that ROV staff take 10 seconds and “wiggle” each of the doors on each of the other seven (7) high-speed Optech ballot scanners/counters. ROV staff refused to perform that simple test that would have revealed if other counting units were similarly unlocked.

Loose doors that *appear* secured give a perfect *opportunity* to change election results without a trace.

Election Officers' Comment Sheet Overview

The Election Officers' Comment Sheet provides a first-hand report from volunteer poll workers responsible for an individual precinct. Save R Vote requested to view these documents at the desk in the lobby of the Registrar of Voter's office. The comment sheets had been pulled from the spiral-bound precinct booklets by ROV staff. More than 300 images were photographed from the pages provided. Select comments were then transcribed from these images for this report.

Several themes emerge from reviewing these documents.

Training: While a DVD provided by the Registrar of Voters to poll workers was generally commended, several election officers suggested that the training classes needed improvement. Notes reflect that inadequately trained poll workers allowed dozens of voters to cast ballots without signing the precinct roster voters (Precinct 11418).

Provisional Ballots: Numerous precincts ran out of paper provisional ballots by mid-afternoon. Precinct 11521 reported mistakenly providing regular voters with provisional ballots for the first two hours.

Vote By Mail: Many notations of VBM voters claiming they never received election material (Precincts 11707, 14007).

Paper Ballots: The unusual ballot design continues to befuddle voters. Election officers provided suggestions to improve signs instructing voters how to mark the ballot (Precincts 11402, 30934, 35732).

Electronic Voting: The comments show a voter and poll worker preference to bring back the familiar voting machines. Some election officers made notations when the units needed paper changes, experienced printer problems or other malfunctions with voting units. Precinct 11104 reported that the audio would not work on their Assistive Voting Unit for a visually impaired woman, but the woman was able to vote thanks to a magnifying glass. Precinct 21111 noted: "Voters had a hard time reading the font on the veri-vote machine. Font needs to be bolder and more senior-citizen friendly"

Registration/Precinct Changes: Typos, mix-ups with registration include voters changed to VBM, who did not request the change. Voters accustomed to voting at the same precinct for years were switched to other precincts. Precinct 14007 reported: "Large # of voters are listed as "Vote by mail" but they did not request that nor received a ballot. Large # of voters received sample ballot with this as their polling place but they were not listed on the roster." Precinct 51014 noted: "Several people (30 or 40) have been dismayed that they have voted at this precinct for years and their names are left out of our roster."

Conclusions: Poor training and changes in registration status and polling location instigated by the Registrar of Voters frustrated and possibly disenfranchised a significant number of voters and contributed to a widespread increase in the use and depletion of provisional ballots. Voting machines are preferred when the alternative is a nonconforming paper ballot design and poll workers receiving inadequate training also

prefer the voting system that are more familiar to them. It is noteworthy that a voter that really could have used the assistance of a voting device ended up relying on a magnifying glass to vote and as noted from a different precinct, due to the small print on the VeriVote printers, visually impaired voters are unable to verify their ballot choices were recorded as selected.

Precinct Registered Voter Review

See attached spreadsheet.

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
using data from the
November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	
1	Precincts are limited to 1,000 registered voters per EC 12223							Over 1,000 limit by	Under 1,000 limit by	% over or under limit	Within reasonable limits	15 - 24% above or below limits						
2	Precinct #	Registered	Precinct Ballots Cast	Ballots by mail	Turnout						25-34% below limits	35% or more below limits	25-34% above limits	35% or more above limits				
3	11-104	11104	1153	532	324	74.2%		153	0	15%								
4	11-111	11111	812	396	227	76.7%		0	-188	-19%								
5	11-113	11113	1231	627	343	78.8%		231	0	23%								
6	11-115	11115	817	350	324	82.5%		0	-183	-18%								
7	11-200	11200	928	366	180	58.8%		0	-72	-7%								
8	11-201	11201	992	528	165	69.9%		0	-8	-1%								
9	11-203	11203	1230	642	216	69.8%		230	0	23%								
10	11-204	11204	1516	715	523	81.7%	Double Board	516	0	52%	Riverside/WD2							
11	11-205	11205	763	315	167	63.2%	Double Board	0	-237	-24%								
12	11-208	11208	1138	482	252	64.5%	Double Board	138	0	14%								
13	11-210	11210	1342	673	101	57.7%	Double Board	342	0	34%	Riverside/WD2							
14	11-212	11212	731	350	148	68.1%	Double Board	0	-269	-27%	Riverside/WD2							
15	11-214	11214	828	352	320	81.2%	Double Board	0	-172	-17%								
16	11-218	11218	1082	514	390	83.5%		82	0	8%								
17	11-219	11219	1307	633	390	78.3%		307	0	31%	Riverside/WD2							
18	11-222	11222	1300	530	552	83.2%		300	0	30%	Riverside/WD2							
19	11-224	11224	838	366	274	76.4%	Double Board	0	-162	-16%								
20	11-225	11225	1644	590	848	87.5%	Double Board	644	0	64%	Riverside/WD2							
21	11-227	11227	846	386	272	77.8%	Double Board	0	-154	-15%								
22	11-301	11301	1231	588	313	73.2%		231	0	23%								
23	11-305	11305	1331	559	617	88.4%	Double Board	331	0	33%	Riverside/WD3							
24	11-307	11307	877	354	377	83.4%	Double Board	0	-123	-12%								
25	11-308	11308	1407	596	615	86.1%		407	0	41%	Riverside/WD3							
26	11-402	11402	1062	448	289	69.4%		62	0	6%								
27	11-404	11404	1201	556	314	72.4%		201	0	20%								
28	11-406	11406	999	474	308	78.3%		0	-1	0%								
29	11-408	11408	1202	464	555	84.8%		202	0	20%								
30	11-409	11409	1599	586	750	83.6%		599	0	60%	Riverside/WD4							
31	11-411	11411	1329	473	672	86.2%	Double Board	329	0	33%	Riverside/WD4							
32	11-414	11414	984	369	477	86.0%	Double Board	0	-16	-2%								
33	11-415	11415	1253	480	603	86.4%		253	0	25%	Riverside/WD4							
34	11-417	11417	1159	483	490	84.0%	Double Board	159	0	16%								
35	11-418	11418	888	327	415	83.6%		0	-112	-11%								
36	11-419	11419	671	301	279	86.4%	Double Board	0	-329	-33%	Riverside/WD4							
37	11-420	11420	938	464	298	81.2%		0	-62	-6%								
38	11-421	11421	922	461	300	82.5%		0	-78	-8%								
39	11-422	11422	1577	609	683	81.9%		577	0	58%	Riverside/WD4							
40	11-424	11424	1079	487	379	80.3%	Double Board	79	0	8%								
41	11-428	11428	1244	589	430	81.9%	Double Board	244	0	24%								
42	11-429	11429	1349	632	462	81.1%	Double Board	349	0	35%	Riverside/WD4							
43	11-430	11430	1002	471	387	85.6%	Double Board	2	0	0%								
44	11-431	11431	823	364	337	85.2%	Double Board	0	-177	-18%								
45	11-433	11433	1329	591	489	81.3%		329	0	33%								
46	11-434	11434	811	399	287	84.6%		0	-189	-19%								
47	11-436	11436	958	457	348	84.0%		0	-42	-4%								
48	11-439	11439	701	317	276	84.6%	Double Board	0	-299	-30%								
49	11-442	11442	1001	458	321	77.8%		1	0	0%								
50	11-443	11443	626	286	198	77.3%		0	-374	-37%	Riverside/WD4							
51	11-444	11444	781	345	289	83.3%		0	-239	-24%								
52	11-500	11500	836	420	203	74.5%		0	-164	-16%								
53	11-501	11501	872	426	246	77.1%		0	-128	-13%								
54	11-502	11502	1395	585	509	78.4%	Double Board	395	0	40%	Riverside/WD5							
55	11-504	11504	664	300	238	81.0%		0	-336	-34%	Riverside/WD5							
56	11-507	11507	950	470	252	76.0%		0	-50	-5%								

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
using data from the
November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
57	11-509	11509	682	331	205	78.6%	Double Board	0	-318	-32%	Riverside/WD5						
58	11-510	11510	866	385	276	76.3%		0	-134	-13%							
59	11-511	11511	690	314	150	67.2%		0	-310	-31%	Riverside/WD5						
60	11-516	11516	1170	522	328	72.6%		170	0	17%							
61	11-517	11517	944	357	384	78.5%		0	-56	-6%							
62	11-518	11518	663	279	294	86.4%		0	-337	-34%	Riverside/WD5						
63	11-521	11521	1007	468	331	79.3%		7	0	1%							
64	11-524	11524	1339	656	389	78.0%		339	0	34%	Riverside/WD5						
65	11-525	11525	1019	540	292	81.6%		19	0	2%							
66	11-526	11526	1503	661	565	81.6%		503	0	50%	Riverside/WD5						
67	11-601	11601	1137	528	245	68.0%		137	0	14%							
68	11-602	11602	1311	712	277	75.4%		311	0	31%	Riverside/WD6						
69	11-605	11605	875	385	216	68.7%	Double Board	0	-125	-13%							
70	11-606	11606	766	277	207	63.2%	Double Board	0	-234	-23%							
71	11-608	11608	663	321	181	75.7%	Double Board	0	-337	-34%	Riverside/WD6						
72	11-609	11609	806	438	222	81.9%	Double Board	0	-194	-19%							
73	11-610	11610	844	411	200	72.4%		0	-156	-16%							
74	11-611	11611	1252	574	354	74.1%		252	0	25%	Riverside/WD6						
75	11-619	11619	950	322	412	77.3%		0	-50	-5%							
76	11-620	11620	1051	481	292	73.5%		51	0	5%							
77	11-624	11624	908	430	275	77.6%		0	-92	-9%							
78	11-625	11625	827	398	205	72.9%		0	-173	-17%							
79	11-700	11700	957	467	266	76.6%		0	-43	-4%							
80	11-701	11701	665	361	128	73.5%	Double Board	0	-335	-34%	Riverside/WD7						
81	11-702	11702	788	382	168	69.8%	Double Board	0	-212	-21%							
82	11-703	11703	847	438	160	70.6%	Double Board	0	-153	-15%							
83	11-704	11704	758	374	170	71.8%	Double Board	0	-242	-24%							
84	11-705	11705	795	373	236	76.6%		0	-205	-21%							
85	11-706	11706	781	370	207	73.9%		0	-219	-22%							
86	11-707	11707	662	291	133	64.0%		0	-338	-34%	Riverside/WD7						
87	11-713	11713	702	319	232	78.5%		0	-298	-30%	Riverside/WD7						
88	11-714	11714	949	499	218	75.6%		0	-51	-5%							
89	11-716	11716	1284	564	474	80.8%	Double Board	284	0	28%	Riverside/WD7						
90	11-718	11718	1114	504	256	68.2%	Double Board	114	0	11%							
91	11-719	11719	1109	539	247	70.9%	Double Board	109	0	11%							
92	11-720	11720	1081	527	339	80.1%	Double Board	81	0	8%							
93	11-721	11721	666	327	237	84.7%		0	-334	-33%	Riverside/WD7						
94	11-723	11723	1267	639	348	77.9%		267	0	27%	Riverside/WD7						
95	11-861	11861	1217	591	425	83.5%		217	0	22%							
96	11-862	11862	724	463	170	87.4%		0	-276	-28%	Lake Hills						
97	11-870	11870	1482	698	522	82.3%		482	0	48%	Mockingbird Cyn.						
98	11-872	11872	1075	552	331	82.1%		75	0	8%							
99	11-900	11900	836	373	343	85.6%		0	-164	-16%							
100	11-901	11901	854	468	260	85.2%	Double Board	0	-146	-15%							
101	11-902	11902	957	475	320	83.1%	Double Board	0	-43	-4%							
102	11-905	11905	1071	467	407	81.6%		71	0	7%							
103	11-912	11912	1004	427	423	84.7%		4	0	0%							
104	11-927	11927	959	405	400	83.9%		0	-41	-4%							
105	11-929	11929	1075	468	422	82.8%	Double Board	75	0	8%							
106	11-930	11930	1040	509	338	81.4%	Double Board	40	0	4%							
107	11-932	11932	775	411	215	80.8%	Double Board	0	-225	-23%							
108	11-948	11948	1264	561	407	76.6%		264	0	26%	Mead Valley						
109	11-953	11953	1386	576	395	70.1%		386	0	39%	Mead Valley						
110	11-954	11954	1195	480	297	65.0%		195	0	20%							
111	11-959	11959	908	357	288	71.0%	Double Board	0	-92	-9%							
112	11-961	11961	1002	445	241	68.5%	Double Board	2	0	0%							
113	11-980	11980	585	236	283	88.7%		0	-415	-42%	AF Village W.						
114	12-601	12601	912	426	318	81.6%		0	-88	-9%							
115	12-602	12602	1044	493	321	78.0%		44	0	4%							
116	12-603	12603	1228	613	375	80.5%		228	0	23%							

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
using data from the
November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
117	12-651	12651	1850	629	1008	88.5%		850	0	85%	Glen Ivy						
118	12-652	12652	701	331	273	86.2%		0	-299	-30%	Glen Ivy						
119	12-655	12655	1064	595	337	87.6%		64	0	6%							
120	12-705	12705	1099	559	311	79.2%	Triple Board	99	0	10%							
121	12-709	12709	691	388	168	80.5%	Triple Board	0	-309	-31%	Horsethief Cyn.						
122	12-710	12710	1192	687	313	83.9%	Triple Board	192	0	19%							
123	12-851	12851	890	464	255	80.8%		0	-110	-11%							
124	14-007	14007	902	466	311	86.1%	Double Board	0	-98	-10%							
125	14-009	14009	1020	518	304	80.6%	Double Board	20	0	2%							
126	14-011	14011	1068	477	313	74.0%		68	0	7%							
127	14-013	14013	1387	698	351	75.6%		387	0	39%	Lake Elsinore						
128	14-015	14015	1024	498	293	77.2%		24	0	2%							
129	14-021	14021	885	395	240	71.8%		0	-115	-12%							
130	14-022	14022	1151	537	281	71.1%		151	0	15%							
131	14-023	14023	1399	682	324	71.9%		399	0	40%	Lake Elsinore						
132	14-025	14025	1157	571	234	69.6%		157	0	16%							
133	14-027	14027	762	384	211	78.1%		0	-238	-24%							
134	14-031	14031	815	434	254	84.4%		0	-185	-19%							
135	14-037	14037	1554	811	523	85.8%		554	0	55%	Lake Elsinore						
136	14-038	14038	721	323	226	76.1%		0	-279	-28%	Lake Elsinore						
137	14-044	14044	1509	745	529	84.4%		509	0	51%	Lake Elsinore						
138	14-503	14503	644	358	191	85.2%		0	-356	-36%	Lake Elsinore						
139	14-800	14800	788	356	192	69.5%		0	-212	-21%							
140	14-804	14804	1329	588	325	68.7%		329	0	33%	Lakeland Vlg.						
141	14-809	14809	530	273	106	71.5%		0	-470	-47%	Lakeland Vlg.						
142	15-810	15810	740	326	268	80.3%		0	-260	-26%	Gavilan Hills						
143	18-603	18603	1638	762	689	88.6%		638	0	64%	Santa Rosa						
144	18-611	18611	1234	549	559	89.8%		234	0	23%							
145	19-000	19000	662	310	154	70.1%		0	-338	-34%	Wildomar						
146	19-007	19007	1378	656	433	79.0%		378	0	38%	Wildomar						
147	19-014	19014	1652	698	635	80.7%		652	0	65%	Wildomar						
148	19-016	19016	1179	560	347	76.9%		179	0	18%							
149	19-017	19017	914	413	296	77.6%		0	-86	-9%							
150	19-018	19018	837	381	250	75.4%		0	-163	-16%							
151	19-026	19026	766	357	244	78.5%		0	-234	-23%							
152	19-029	19029	1057	555	310	81.8%	Double Board	57	0	6%							
153	19-030	19030	991	494	303	80.4%		0	-9	-1%							
154	19-031	19031	1444	619	501	77.6%	Double Board	444	0	44%	Wildomar						
155	19-033	19033	1252	638	419	84.4%		252	0	25%	Wildomar						
156	21-100	21100	811	397	213	75.2%		0	-189	-19%							
157	21-103	21103	657	277	170	68.0%		0	-343	-34%	Riverside/WD1						
158	21-104	21104	1166	577	254	71.3%		166	0	17%							
159	21-108	21108	922	463	288	81.5%		0	-78	-8%							
160	21-111	21111	1157	460	405	74.8%		157	0	16%							
161	21-113	21113	1208	523	308	68.8%		208	0	21%							
162	21-114	21114	833	368	288	78.8%		0	-167	-17%							
163	21-118	21118	922	396	322	77.9%		0	-78	-8%							
164	21-120	21120	829	393	307	84.4%	Double Board	0	-171	-17%							
165	21-121	21121	892	538	251	88.5%		0	-108	-11%							
166	21-122	21122	713	323	241	79.1%	Double Board	0	-287	-29%	Riverside/WD1						
167	21-123	21123	798	388	270	82.5%	Double Board	0	-202	-20%							
168	21-125	21125	1240	506	492	80.5%	Double Board	240	0	24%							
169	21-301	21301	1481	688	463	77.7%	Double Board	481	0	48%	Riverside/WD3						
170	21-304	21304	911	412	293	77.4%	Double Board	0	-89	-9%							
171	21-305	21305	947	446	225	70.9%	Double Board	0	-53	-5%							
172	21-309	21309	1014	497	318	80.4%	Double Board	14	0	1%							
173	21-311	21311	1479	658	566	82.8%	Double Board	479	0	48%	Riverside/WD3						
174	21-312	21312	902	383	351	81.4%	Double Board	0	-98	-10%							
175	21-314	21314	1011	454	299	74.5%	Double Board	11	0	1%							
176	21-316	21316	1432	689	448	79.4%		432	0	43%	Riverside/WD3						
177	21-318	21318	790	397	224	78.6%		0	-210	-21%							

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
using data from the
November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
178	21-319	21319	843	392	244	75.4%		0	-157	-16%							
179	21-320	21320	844	400	265	78.8%	Double Board	0	-156	-16%							
180	21-800	21800	592	338	82	70.9%		0	-408	-41%	Swan Lake						
181	21-805	21805	828	388	262	78.5%		0	-172	-17%							
182	21-811	21811	894	464	207	75.1%		0	-106	-11%							
183	21-815	21815	1672	768	538	78.1%		672	0	67%	Mira Loma						
184	21-817	21817	1321	683	379	80.4%		321	0	32%	Mira Loma						
185	21-819	21819	592	248	153	67.7%	Double Board	0	-408	-41%	Mira Loma						
186	21-821	21821	1227	633	311	76.9%		227	0	23%							
187	21-822	21822	1180	530	274	68.1%	Double Board	180	0	18%							
188	21-825	21825	1334	668	423	81.8%		334	0	33%	Mira Loma						
189	21-827	21827	1515	764	503	83.6%		515	0	52%	Mira Loma						
190	21-830	21830	609	285	142	70.1%		0	-391	-39%	Mira Loma						
191	21-832	21832	1573	735	493	78.1%		573	0	57%	Mira Loma						
192	21-833	21833	1706	818	625	84.6%		706	0	71%	Mira Loma						
193	21-835	21835	1652	868	502	82.9%		652	0	65%	Mira Loma						
194	21-836	21836	1074	576	326	84.0%		74	0	7%							
195	21-838	21838	1604	721	568	80.4%		604	0	60%	Mira Loma						
196	21-844	21844	1740	852	554	80.8%		740	0	74%	Mira Loma						
197	21-851	21851	498	247	88	67.3%		0	-502	-50%	Glen Avon						
198	21-852	21852	997	453	275	73.0%		0	-3	0%							
199	21-860	21860	984	554	192	75.8%	Double Board	0	-16	-2%							
200	21-861	21861	721	378	142	72.1%		0	-279	-28%	Glen Avon						
201	21-870	21870	946	479	213	73.2%	Double Board	0	-54	-5%							
202	21-871	21871	1008	537	292	82.2%		8	0	1%							
203	21-872	21872	927	454	310	82.4%		0	-73	-7%							
204	21-874	21874	1185	569	284	72.0%		185	0	19%							
205	21-877	21877	1115	559	268	74.2%	Double Board	115	0	12%							
206	21-880	21880	1381	686	360	75.7%	Triple Board	381	0	38%	Indian Hills						
207	21-883	21883	595	274	183	76.8%		0	-405	-41%	Indian Hills						
208	21-884	21884	972	553	258	83.4%	Triple Board	0	-28	-3%							
209	21-885	21885	980	522	286	82.4%	Triple Board	0	-20	-2%							
210	21-901	21901	1344	668	396	79.2%	Double Board	344	0	34%	Jurupa						
211	21-910	21910	690	364	153	74.9%		0	-310	-31%	Sunnyslope						
212	21-911	21911	968	530	220	77.5%		0	-32	-3%							
213	21-922	21922	531	277	68	65.0%		0	-469	-47%	Belltown						
214	21-951	21951	948	458	225	72.0%		0	-52	-5%							
215	21-957	21957	771	394	194	76.3%		0	-229	-23%							
216	21-958	21958	918	394	209	65.7%		0	-82	-8%							
217	21-959	21959	985	430	227	66.7%		0	-15	-2%							
218	21-961	21961	711	410	159	80.0%		0	-289	-29%	Rubidoux						
219	21-962	21962	800	375	225	75.0%		0	-200	-20%							
220	21-963	21963	760	362	92	59.7%		0	-240	-24%							
221	21-964	21964	890	365	145	57.3%		0	-110	-11%							
222	21-966	21966	810	365	189	68.4%		0	-190	-19%							
223	22-000	22000	838	457	268	86.5%		0	-162	-16%							
224	22-002	22002	1101	574	343	83.3%	Double Board	101	0	10%							
225	22-003	22003	861	452	269	83.7%	Double Board	0	-139	-14%							
226	22-004	22004	1012	484	295	77.0%		12	0	1%							
227	22-008	22008	1345	566	442	74.9%		345	0	35%	Corona						
228	22-011	22011	761	378	234	80.4%		0	-239	-24%							
229	22-012	22012	1245	660	377	83.3%		245	0	25%	Corona						
230	22-013	22013	769	406	217	81.0%	Triple Board	0	-231	-23%							
231	22-014	22014	849	436	256	81.5%		0	-151	-15%							
232	22-015	22015	878	434	281	81.4%	Triple Board	0	-122	-12%							
233	22-016	22016	1208	641	287	76.8%		208	0	21%							
234	22-019	22019	1188	552	297	71.5%	Triple Board	188	0	19%							
235	22-020	22020	878	393	205	68.1%	Triple Board	0	-122	-12%							
236	22-022	22022	736	356	229	79.5%		0	-264	-26%	Corona						
237	22-024	22024	1138	636	295	81.8%		138	0	14%							
238	22-028	22028	1492	730	527	84.2%		492	0	49%	Corona						

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
using data from the
November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
239	22-029	22029	943	432	319	79.6%		0	-57	-6%							
240	22-031	22031	1199	641	384	85.5%		199	0	20%							
241	22-032	22032	824	440	268	85.9%	Double Board	0	-176	-18%							
242	22-033	22033	1061	515	381	84.4%		61	0	6%							
243	22-034	22034	789	363	213	73.0%	Double Board	0	-211	-21%							
244	22-036	22036	699	374	150	75.0%		0	-301	-30%	Corona						
245	22-038	22038	972	432	332	78.6%		0	-28	-3%							
246	22-039	22039	1212	498	313	66.9%		212	0	21%							
247	22-042	22042	1319	545	378	70.0%		319	0	32%	Corona						
248	22-043	22043	1045	525	215	70.8%		45	0	5%							
249	22-045	22045	989	410	307	72.5%		0	-11	-1%							
250	22-047	22047	1186	564	312	73.9%		186	0	19%							
251	22-048	22048	1326	609	469	81.3%		326	0	33%	Corona						
252	22-051	22051	1427	695	425	78.5%		427	0	43%	Corona						
253	22-052	22052	1271	567	471	81.7%		271	0	27%	Corona						
254	22-053	22053	670	362	209	85.2%	Double Board	0	-330	-33%	Corona						
255	22-056	22056	1176	494	443	79.7%		176	0	18%							
256	22-058	22058	1148	539	316	74.5%	Double Board	148	0	15%							
257	22-060	22060	710	307	239	76.9%	Double Board	0	-290	-29%	Corona						
258	22-061	22061	882	410	302	80.7%	Double Board	0	-118	-12%							
259	22-062	22062	931	471	297	82.5%	Double Board	0	-69	-7%							
260	22-064	22064	894	465	283	83.7%	Double Board	0	-106	-11%							
261	22-065	22065	839	399	290	82.1%	Double Board	0	-161	-16%							
262	22-066	22066	796	405	238	80.8%	Double Board	0	-204	-20%							
263	22-067	22067	996	514	297	81.4%		0	-4	0%							
264	22-068	22068	909	466	298	84.0%		0	-91	-9%							
265	22-069	22069	909	399	370	84.6%	Double Board	0	-91	-9%							
266	22-070	22070	1251	601	389	79.1%		251	0	25%	Corona						
267	22-073	22073	947	518	302	86.6%	Double Board	0	-53	-5%							
268	22-074	22074	895	442	298	82.7%		0	-105	-11%							
269	22-076	22076	1524	765	503	83.2%	Double Board	524	0	52%	Corona						
270	22-077	22077	1328	597	500	82.6%	Double Board	328	0	33%	Corona						
271	22-079	22079	772	372	254	81.1%		0	-228	-23%							
272	22-080	22080	734	338	259	81.3%	Double Board	0	-266	-27%	Corona						
273	22-081	22081	922	460	301	82.5%	Double Board	0	-78	-8%							
274	22-082	22082	746	384	209	79.5%	Double Board	0	-254	-25%	Corona						
275	22-084	22084	1389	679	471	82.8%	Double Board	389	0	39%	Corona						
276	22-086	22086	1166	566	393	82.2%		166	0	17%							
277	22-087	22087	805	387	288	83.9%	Double Board	0	-195	-20%							
278	22-089	22089	873	407	325	83.8%		0	-127	-13%							
279	22-090	22090	904	417	327	82.3%	Double Board	0	-96	-10%							
280	22-091	22091	1269	633	420	83.0%	Double Board	269	0	27%	Corona						
281	22-826	22826	1070	535	344	82.1%	Double Board	70	0	7%							
282	22-857	22857	1155	501	292	68.7%	Triple Board	155	0	16%							
283	22-858	22858	1263	584	319	71.5%	Triple Board	263	0	26%	Home Gardens						
284	22-905	22905	1228	615	373	80.5%	Double Board	228	0	23%							
285	22-907	22907	1093	500	318	74.8%	Double Board	93	0	9%							
286	23-002	23002	1292	663	383	81.0%		292	0	29%							
287	23-005	23005	1213	686	271	78.9%	Double Board	213	0	21%							
288	23-008	23008	854	454	196	76.1%	Double Board	0	-146	-15%							
289	23-010	23010	1243	661	289	76.4%	Double Board	243	0	24%							
290	23-013	23013	1401	636	536	83.7%		401	0	40%	Norco						
291	23-016	23016	754	357	220	76.5%		0	-246	-25%	Norco						
292	23-017	23017	823	412	206	75.1%		0	-177	-18%							
293	23-018	23018	1107	459	382	76.0%	Double Board	107	0	11%							
294	23-020	23020	1086	492	345	77.1%		86	0	9%							

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
using data from the
November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
295	23-023	23023	845	370	241	72.3%		0	-155	-16%							
296	23-024	23024	658	333	195	80.2%		0	-342	-34%	Norco						
297	30-003	30003	846	389	351	87.5%		0	-154	-15%							
298	30-004	30004	1043	460	417	84.1%		43	0	4%							
299	30-006	30006	1015	528	378	89.3%	Double Board	15	0	2%							
300	30-007	30007	918	531	301	90.6%	Double Board	0	-82	-8%							
301	30-009	30009	1162	621	376	85.8%	Double Board	162	0	16%							
302	30-011	30011	1397	634	549	84.7%		397	0	40%	Murrieta						
303	30-015	30015	1045	524	357	84.3%		45	0	5%							
304	30-016	30016	1079	537	385	85.4%		79	0	8%							
305	30-021	30021	1381	697	401	79.5%		381	0	38%	Murrieta						
306	30-050	30050	957	469	308	81.2%	Double Board	0	-43	-4%							
307	30-053	30053	681	326	238	82.8%	Double Board	0	-319	-32%	Murrieta						
308	30-054	30054	1003	544	293	83.4%		3	0	0%							
309	30-059	30059	1003	541	339	87.7%	Double Board	3	0	0%							
310	30-061	30061	773	393	234	81.1%		0	-227	-23%							
311	30-062	30062	1499	760	427	79.2%		499	0	50%	Murrieta						
312	30-063	30063	866	335	466	92.5%	Double Board	0	-134	-13%							
313	30-065	30065	1352	434	817	92.5%	Double Board	352	0	35%	Murrieta						
314	30-066	30066	1176	608	370	83.2%		176	0	18%							
315	30-070	30070	885	394	355	84.6%	Double Board	0	-115	-12%							
316	30-072	30072	700	403	173	82.3%		0	-300	-30%							
317	30-074	30074	944	451	318	81.5%		0	-56	-6%							
318	30-075	30075	1099	571	384	86.9%	Double Board	99	0	10%							
319	30-077	30077	896	427	311	82.4%	Double Board	0	-104	-10%							
320	30-078	30078	1040	575	297	83.8%		40	0	4%							
321	30-079	30079	804	424	198	77.4%	Double Board	0	-196	-20%							
322	30-080	30080	651	326	191	79.4%	Double Board	0	-349	-35%	Murrieta						
323	30-082	30082	692	384	154	77.7%		0	-308	-31%	Murrieta						
324	30-092	30092	1061	555	312	81.7%		61	0	6%							
325	30-096	30096	1120	566	357	82.4%		120	0	12%							
326	30-099	30099	1168	600	374	83.4%		168	0	17%							
327	30-100	30100	772	397	237	82.1%		0	-228	-23%							
328	30-102	30102	1755	628	830	83.1%		755	0	76%	Murrieta						
329	30-104	30104	949	459	303	80.3%		0	-51	-5%							
330	30-107	30107	1147	571	384	83.3%		147	0	15%							
331	30-109	30109	790	364	290	82.8%		0	-210	-21%							
332	30-114	30114	1308	623	417	79.5%		308	0	31%	Murrieta						
333	30-115	30115	1274	664	394	83.0%		274	0	27%	Murrieta						
334	30-116	30116	1206	532	386	76.1%		206	0	21%							
335	30-119	30119	995	477	330	81.1%		0	-5	-1%							
336	30-121	30121	1371	627	457	79.1%		371	0	37%	Murrieta						
337	30-123	30123	1223	665	338	82.0%		223	0	22%							
338	30-933	30933	593	267	219	82.0%	Double Board	0	-407	-41%	Rancho Calif.						
339	30-934	30934	1252	594	454	83.7%	Double Board	252	0	25%	Rancho Calif.						
340	30-936	30936	1368	673	525	87.6%		368	0	37%	Rancho Calif.						
341	30-962	30962	1490	774	532	87.7%		490	0	49%	Rancho Calif.						
342	30-994	30994	1486	767	479	83.8%	Double Board	486	0	49%	Murrieta Hot Sp.						
343	30-996	30996	1557	623	737	87.3%	Double Board	557	0	56%	Murrieta Hot Sp.						
344	32-904	32904	702	302	240	77.2%		0	-298	-30%	Gilman Hot Spgs.						
345	33-005	33005	1462	698	538	84.5%	Double Board	462	0	46%	Canyon Lake						
346	33-010	33010	1228	577	473	85.5%	Double Board	228	0	23%							
347	33-014	33014	1464	722	546	86.6%	Triple Board	464	0	46%	Canyon Lake						
348	33-019	33019	1277	566	525	85.4%	Triple Board	277	0	28%	Canyon Lake						
349	33-021	33021	740	295	321	83.2%	Triple Board	0	-260	-26%	Canyon Lake						
350	33-901	33901	944	500	249	79.3%		0	-56	-6%							
351	33-902	33902	787	357	251	77.3%		0	-213	-21%							
352	35-702	35702	1872	606	1155	94.1%		872	0	87%	Menifee						
353	35-705	35705	889	384	363	84.0%		0	-111	-11%							

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
using data from the
November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
354	35-706	35706	829	453	242	83.8%		0	-171	-17%							
355	35-707	35707	752	384	240	83.0%	Double Board	0	-248	-25%	Menifee						
356	35-714	35714	1349	620	423	77.3%		349	0	35%	Menifee						
357	35-717	35717	1237	631	377	81.5%		237	0	24%							
358	35-726	35726	555	293	161	81.8%	Double Board	0	-445	-45%	Menifee						
359	35-732	35732	1315	642	386	78.2%		315	0	32%							
360	35-737	35737	1336	622	461	81.1%		336	0	34%							
361	35-798	35798	928	530	327	92.3%		0	-72	-7%							
362	35-854	35854	958	409	400	84.4%		0	-42	-4%							
363	35-856	35856	1185	491	490	82.8%		185	0	19%							
364	35-858	35858	1556	379	994	88.2%		556	0	56%	Sun City						
365	35-863	35863	991	401	295	70.2%		0	-9	-1%							
366	35-866	35866	1544	568	716	83.2%		544	0	54%	Sun City						
367	35-869	35869	1820	454	1093	85.0%	Triple Board	820	0	82%	Sun City						
368	35-871	35871	721	238	360	82.9%		0	-279	-28%	Sun City						
369	35-872	35872	903	410	327	81.6%		0	-97	-10%							
370	35-876	35876	1808	464	1069	84.8%	Triple Board	808	0	81%	Sun City						
371	35-893	35893	1127	552	371	81.9%		127	0	13%							
372	35-894	35894	563	337	125	82.1%		0	-437	-44%	Sun City						
373	35-895	35895	1376	422	746	84.9%	Triple Board	376	0	38%	Sun City						
374	35-896	35896	1226	698	303	81.6%		226	0	23%							
375	35-899	35899	708	341	214	78.4%		0	-292	-29%	Sun City						
376	36-002	36002	1655	636	588	74.0%	Double Board	655	0	66%	San Jacinto						
377	36-003	36003	1021	479	315	77.8%	Double Board	21	0	2%							
378	36-005	36005	1330	637	327	72.5%		330	0	33%							
379	36-016	36016	1257	467	421	70.6%		257	0	26%	San Jacinto						
380	36-019	36019	1305	642	358	76.6%		305	0	31%	San Jacinto						
381	36-021	36021	705	349	216	80.1%		0	-295	-30%	San Jacinto						
382	36-024	36024	1258	472	249	57.3%	Double Board	258	0	26%	San Jacinto						
383	36-027	36027	913	358	256	67.3%		0	-87	-9%							
384	36-034	36034	1192	415	461	73.5%	Double Board	192	0	19%							
385	36-035	36035	1408	585	354	66.7%		408	0	41%	San Jacinto						
386	36-040	36040	840	445	219	79.0%		0	-160	-16%							
387	36-042	36042	644	312	195	78.7%		0	-356	-36%	San Jacinto						
388	37-003	37003	1667	695	626	79.2%		667	0	67%	Hemet						
389	37-007	37007	1539	568	704	82.7%		539	0	54%	Hemet						
390	37-008	37008	838	340	189	63.1%		0	-162	-16%							
391	37-012	37012	687	326	295	90.4%		0	-313	-31%	Hemet						
392	37-018	37018	1652	640	704	81.4%		652	0	65%	Hemet						
393	37-019	37019	1051	438	349	74.9%		51	0	5%							
394	37-023	37023	1260	403	557	76.2%		260	0	26%	Hemet						
395	37-026	37026	1236	418	509	75.0%		236	0	24%							
396	37-027	37027	1005	343	335	67.5%		5	0	1%							
397	37-028	37028	950	384	203	61.8%		0	-50	-5%							
398	37-032	37032	1274	481	369	66.7%		274	0	27%	Hemet						
399	37-035	37035	960	450	317	79.9%		0	-40	-4%							
400	37-039	37039	1008	283	454	73.1%		8	0	1%							
401	37-040	37040	864	265	481	86.3%		0	-136	-14%							
402	37-042	37042	1229	544	382	75.3%		229	0	23%							
403	37-044	37044	1583	528	756	81.1%		583	0	58%	Hemet						
404	37-047	37047	1291	363	653	78.7%		291	0	29%	Hemet						
405	37-048	37048	1264	494	413	71.8%		264	0	26%	Hemet						
406	37-052	37052	877	320	251	65.1%		0	-123	-12%							
407	37-054	37054	983	398	270	68.0%		0	-17	-2%							
408	37-058	37058	1335	592	462	79.0%		335	0	34%	Hemet						
409	37-061	37061	1291	617	326	73.0%		291	0	29%	Hemet						
410	37-064	37064	1907	380	1303	88.3%	Double Board	907	0	91%	Hemet						
411	37-066	37066	1070	431	333	71.4%		70	0	7%							
412	37-071	37071	992	389	365	76.0%	Double Board	0	-8	-1%							
413	37-075	37075	1499	556	798	90.3%		499	0	50%	Hemet						
414	37-076	37076	646	344	172	79.9%		0	-354	-35%	Hemet						
415	37-651	37651	778	399	224	80.1%		0	-222	-22%							
416	37-664	37664	637	303	235	84.5%		0	-363	-36%	Winchester						
417	37-672	37672	1357	721	450	86.3%		357	0	36%	Winchester						

Riverside County
Overside Precinct Analysis
using data from the
November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
418	37-677	37677	652	351	205	85.3%		0	-348	-35%	Winchester						
419	37-678	37678	1159	578	358	80.8%		159	0	16%							
420	37-681	37681	1044	505	357	82.6%		44	0	4%							
421	37-682	37682	1324	600	504	83.4%		324	0	32%	Winchester						
422	37-688	37688	1203	677	342	84.7%		203	0	20%							
423	37-701	37701	1004	431	280	70.8%		4	0	0%							
424	37-704	37704	1342	640	371	75.3%		342	0	34%	East Hemet						
425	37-705	37705	1393	688	344	74.1%		393	0	39%	East Hemet						
426	37-709	37709	732	337	233	77.9%		0	-268	-27%	East Hemet						
427	37-711	37711	1328	596	465	79.9%		328	0	33%							
428	37-712	37712	1439	607	527	78.8%		439	0	44%	East Hemet						
429	37-726	37726	1608	666	633	80.8%		608	0	61%	Valle Vista						
430	37-727	37727	1262	578	403	77.7%		262	0	26%	Valle Vista						
431	37-736	37736	606	247	218	76.7%		0	-394	-39%	Valle Vista						
432	37-739	37739	1424	542	661	84.5%		424	0	42%	Valle Vista						
433	37-894	37894	657	299	259	84.9%		0	-343	-34%	Idyllwild						
434	37-896	37896	1185	562	444	84.9%		185	0	19%							
435	37-928	37928	825	275	399	81.7%		0	-175	-18%							
436	37-982	37982	953	449	340	82.8%	Double Board	0	-47	-5%							
437	37-984	37984	1132	500	422	81.4%	Double Board	132	0	13%							
438	38-003	38003	1623	818	572	85.6%		623	0	62%	Temecula						
439	38-004	38004	804	386	243	78.2%		0	-196	-20%							
440	38-008	38008	600	239	258	82.8%		0	-400	-40%	Temecula						
441	38-011	38011	1145	542	365	79.2%	Double Board	145	0	15%							
442	38-012	38012	1050	491	352	80.3%		50	0	5%							
443	38-017	38017	1368	775	402	86.0%		368	0	37%	Temecula						
444	38-020	38020	1114	591	357	85.1%		114	0	11%							
445	38-023	38023	1378	567	621	86.2%	Double Board	378	0	38%	Temecula						
446	38-025	38025	1472	708	542	84.9%		472	0	47%	Temecula						
447	38-026	38026	1344	655	436	81.2%	Triple Board	344	0	34%	Temecula						
448	38-027	38027	1398	617	629	89.1%	Triple Board	398	0	40%	Temecula						
449	38-028	38028	865	430	330	87.9%	Triple Board	0	-135	-14%							
450	38-030	38030	1147	597	409	87.7%		147	0	15%							
451	38-034	38034	771	329	308	82.6%	Double Board	0	-229	-23%							
452	38-035	38035	1398	721	424	81.9%	Double Board	398	0	40%	Temecula						
453	38-036	38036	779	377	283	84.7%	Double Board	0	-221	-22%							
454	38-038	38038	772	387	263	84.2%	Double Board	0	-228	-23%							
455	38-039	38039	806	417	282	86.7%	Double Board	0	-194	-19%							
456	38-044	38044	1418	653	562	85.7%		418	0	42%	Temecula						
457	38-046	38046	1311	563	584	87.5%		311	0	31%	Temecula						
458	38-047	38047	987	521	314	84.6%	Double Board	0	-13	-1%							
459	38-049	38049	772	393	227	80.3%		0	-228	-23%							
460	38-051	38051	1081	596	349	87.4%		81	0	8%							
461	38-054	38054	1129	675	322	88.3%		129	0	13%							
462	38-055	38055	1430	684	513	83.7%		430	0	43%	Temecula						
463	38-057	38057	841	433	284	85.3%		0	-159	-16%							
464	38-058	38058	1050	542	365	86.4%		50	0	5%							
465	38-059	38059	1046	517	324	80.4%		46	0	5%							
466	38-061	38061	965	505	274	80.7%		0	-35	-4%							
467	38-063	38063	649	356	183	83.1%		0	-351	-35%	Temecula						
468	38-064	38064	1402	768	440	86.2%		402	0	40%	Temecula						
469	38-065	38065	863	421	308	84.5%		0	-137	-14%							
470	38-066	38066	1006	542	339	87.6%	Double Board	6	0	1%							
471	38-067	38067	898	479	304	87.2%	Double Board	0	-102	-10%							
472	38-069	38069	1129	551	330	78.0%	Double Board	129	0	13%							
473	38-070	38070	933	406	364	82.5%		0	-67	-7%							
474	38-074	38074	1094	544	342	81.0%	Double Board	94	0	9%							
475	38-078	38078	1437	668	520	82.7%		437	0	44%	Temecula						
476	40-005	40005	1432	626	409	72.3%	Double Board	432	0	43%	Cathedral City						
477	40-008	40008	1074	422	371	73.8%	Double Board	74	0	7%							

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
using data from the
November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
478	40-009	40009	1240	490	442	75.2%		240	0	24%							
479	40-010	40010	827	365	218	70.5%		0	-173	-17%							
480	40-011	40011	880	356	272	71.4%		0	-120	-12%							
481	40-013	40013	1377	582	422	72.9%		377	0	38%	Cathedral City						
482	40-014	40014	793	314	94	51.5%		0	-207	-21%							
483	40-015	40015	1445	560	481	72.0%		445	0	45%	Cathedral City						
484	40-017	40017	1033	405	272	65.5%		33	0	3%							
485	40-019	40019	913	377	334	77.9%		0	-87	-9%							
486	40-020	40020	903	328	152	53.2%	Double Board	0	-97	-10%							
487	40-021	40021	1181	471	221	58.6%	Double Board	181	0	18%							
488	40-028	40028	1653	470	790	76.2%		653	0	65%	Cathedral City						
489	40-029	40029	1682	525	760	76.4%		682	0	68%	Cathedral City						
490	40-034	40034	1132	417	577	87.8%		132	0	13%							
491	40-035	40035	824	303	255	67.7%		0	-176	-18%							
492	40-041	40041	945	432	354	83.2%		0	-55	-6%							
493	41-003	41003	1971	658	1041	86.2%		971	0	97%	Rancho Mirage						
494	41-005	41005	1510	527	779	86.5%		510	0	51%	Rancho Mirage						
495	41-010	41010	1761	581	955	87.2%		761	0	76%	Rancho Mirage						
496	41-022	41022	1893	511	1011	80.4%		893	0	89%	Rancho Mirage						
497	41-027	41027	1854	579	985	84.4%		854	0	85%	Rancho Mirage						
498	41-028	41028	1369	472	711	86.4%		369	0	37%	Rancho Mirage						
499	42-007	42007	2108	681	1212	89.8%		1108	0	111%	Palm Desert						
500	42-011	42011	2047	668	1119	87.3%		1047	0	105%	Palm Desert						
501	42-014	42014	2140	608	1166	82.9%		1140	0	114%	Palm Desert						
502	42-015	42015	1439	481	675	80.3%		439	0	44%	Palm Desert						
503	42-019	42019	1382	494	661	83.6%		382	0	38%	Palm Desert						
504	42-021	42021	1757	680	796	84.0%	Triple Board	757	0	76%	Palm Desert						
505	42-024	42024	1034	345	502	81.9%	Triple Board	34	0	3%							
506	42-025	42025	901	403	371	85.9%	Triple Board	0	-99	-10%							792089
507	42-026	42026	914	365	398	83.5%		0	-86	-9%							
508	42-029	42029	1496	555	556	74.3%		496	0	50%	Palm Desert						
509	42-031	42031	1623	641	633	78.5%		623	0	62%	Palm Desert						
510	42-036	42036	1129	485	414	79.6%		129	0	13%							
511	42-039	42039	1251	512	495	80.5%		251	0	25%	Palm Desert						
512	42-043	42043	1802	653	879	85.0%		802	0	80%	Palm Desert						
513	42-045	42045	1240	452	640	88.1%	Double Board	240	0	24%							
514	42-046	42046	1678	530	877	83.8%	Double Board	678	0	68%	Palm Desert						
515	42-806	42806	1286	596	288	68.7%		286	0	29%	Thousand Palms						
516	42-810	42810	1731	532	913	83.5%		731	0	73%	Thousand Palms						
517	42-856	42856	1450	658	489	79.1%		450	0	45%	Bermuda Dunes						
518	42-869	42869	828	335	358	83.7%		0	-172	-17%							
519	42-870	42870	1476	538	705	84.2%		476	0	48%	Bermuda Dunes						
520	42-900	42900	2891	527	2170	93.3%	Double Board	1891	0	189%	Del Webb			Del Webb Palm Dsr			
521	42-904	42904	3005	615	2145	91.8%	Double Board	2005	0	201%	Del Webb			Del Webb Palm Dsr			
522	43-005	43005	1101	358	637	90.4%		101	0	10%							
523	43-009	43009	1491	500	815	88.2%		491	0	49%	Indian Wells						
524	44-000	44000	1081	494	430	85.5%	Double Board	81	0	8%							
525	44-003	44003	674	300	236	79.5%		0	-326	-33%	La Quinta						
526	44-006	44006	1518	633	610	81.9%	Double Board	518	0	52%	La Quinta						
527	44-007	44007	1554	583	652	79.5%		554	0	55%	La Quinta						
528	44-011	44011	2044	694	1030	84.3%		1044	0	104%	La Quinta			La Quinta			
529	44-016	44016	998	453	301	75.6%	Double Board	0	-2	0%							
530	44-017	44017	1792	651	819	82.0%		792	0	79%	La Quinta						
531	44-019	44019	1109	382	565	85.4%		109	0	11%							
532	44-021	44021	1283	546	450	77.6%	Double Board	283	0	28%	La Quinta						
533	44-024	44024	1281	555	337	69.6%		281	0	28%	La Quinta						
534	44-025	44025	1303	539	426	74.1%		303	0	30%	La Quinta						
535	44-027	44027	926	349	367	77.3%		0	-74	-7%							
536	44-038	44038	1531	529	834	89.0%		531	0	53%	La Quinta						
537	45-000	45000	1050	433	341	73.7%		50	0	5%							
538	45-004	45004	2179	655	1359	92.4%		1179	0	118%	Indio						
539	45-005	45005	1521	706	531	81.3%	Double Board	521	0	52%	Indio						

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
using data from the
November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
540	45-009	45009	855	319	210	61.9%		0	-145	-15%							
541	45-010	45010	1376	428	756	86.0%		376	0	38%	Indio						
542	45-013	45013	1340	469	314	58.4%		340	0	34%	Indio						
543	45-015	45015	806	307	161	58.1%		0	-194	-19%							
544	45-016	45016	687	283	124	59.2%		0	-313	-31%	Indio						
545	45-021	45021	977	428	236	68.0%	Double Board	0	-23	-2%							
546	45-025	45025	1084	411	276	63.4%		84	0	8%							
547	45-029	45029	1001	390	339	72.8%		1	0	0%							
548	45-031	45031	1314	525	263	60.0%	Double Board	314	0	31%	Indio						
549	45-032	45032	912	332	178	55.9%		0	-88	-9%							
550	45-036	45036	1028	436	268	68.5%		28	0	3%							
551	45-037	45037	832	344	280	75.0%	Double Board	0	-168	-17%							
552	45-038	45038	908	359	226	64.4%	Double Board	0	-92	-9%							
553	45-040	45040	1452	532	376	62.5%		452	0	45%	Indio						
554	45-042	45042	1053	420	448	82.4%	Double Board	53	0	5%							
555	45-043	45043	1129	431	394	73.1%	Double Board	129	0	13%							
556	45-046	45046	1539	674	625	84.4%		539	0	54%	Indio						
557	45-049	45049	1309	458	549	76.9%		309	0	31%							
558	45-051	45051	1626	627	603	75.6%	Double Board	626	0	63%	Indio- Restaurant						
559	45-981	45981	1001	407	253	65.9%		1	0	0%							
560	46-007	46007	1214	570	282	70.2%	Double Board	214	0	21%							
561	46-011	46011	1367	570	265	61.1%	Double Board	367	0	37%	Coachella						
562	46-021	46021	1338	537	257	59.3%		338	0	34%	Coachella						
563	46-022	46022	928	397	155	59.5%	Triple Board	0	-72	-7%							
564	46-024	46024	745	253	128	51.1%	Triple Board	0	-255	-26%	Coachella						
565	46-025	46025	966	351	128	49.6%		0	-34	-3%							
566	46-030	46030	975	403	141	55.8%	Triple Board	0	-25	-3%							
567	46-031	46031	1114	413	215	56.4%		114	0	11%							
568	46-704	46704	1045	352	293	61.7%	Double Board	45	0	5%							
569	46-710	46710	652	278	116	60.4%	Double Board	0	-348	-35%	Thermal						
570	46-757	46757	1181	447	244	59.5%		161	0	16%							
571	47-005	47005	1293	643	370	78.3%		293	0	29%	Blythe						
572	47-010	47010	1424	615	425	73.0%		424	0	42%	Blythe						
573	47-011	47011	1198	451	241	57.8%		198	0	20%							
574	47-018	47018	1159	473	243	61.8%		159	0	16%							
575	49-002	49002	1397	534	551	77.7%		397	0	40%	Palm Springs						
576	49-004	49004	1075	398	435	77.5%		75	0	8%							
577	49-005	49005	838	355	269	74.5%		0	-162	-16%							
578	49-006	49006	1227	469	566	84.4%	Double Board	227	0	23%							
579	49-008	49008	1447	519	574	75.5%		447	0	45%	Palm Springs						
580	49-009	49009	1300	534	525	81.5%	Double Board	300	0	30%	Palm Springs						
581	49-012	49012	1062	379	322	66.0%		62	0	6%							
582	49-013	49013	1303	504	539	80.0%		303	0	30%	Palm Springs						
583	49-016	49016	1170	470	406	74.9%		170	0	17%							
584	49-017	49017	1267	511	524	81.7%		267	0	27%	Palm Springs						
585	49-018	49018	1476	497	741	83.9%	Double Board	476	0	48%	Palm Springs						
586	49-019	49019	1095	385	555	85.8%		95	0	10%							
587	49-023	49023	1649	559	807	82.8%		649	0	65%	Palm Springs						
588	49-025	49025	1422	517	740	88.4%	Double Board	422	0	42%	Palm Springs						
589	49-026	49026	1430	497	728	85.7%		430	0	43%	Palm Springs						
590	50-000	50000	1374	789	433	88.9%		374	0	37%	Beaumont						
591	50-010	50010	1636	537	988	93.2%		636	0	64%	Beaumont						
592	50-012	50012	959	425	374	83.3%		0	-41	-4%							
593	50-013	50013	1440	716	441	80.3%		440	0	44%	Beaumont						
594	50-023	50023	1050	532	295	78.8%		50	0	5%							
595	50-024	50024	841	435	214	77.2%		0	-159	-16%							
596	50-025	50025	670	352	175	78.7%		0	-330	-33%	Beaumont						
597	50-026	50026	773	403	176	74.9%		0	-227	-23%							
598	50-038	50038	677	266	171	64.5%		0	-323	-32%	Beaumont						
599	50-042	50042	1268	500	625	88.7%		268	0	27%	Beaumont						
600	50-058	50058	1493	714	515	82.3%		493	0	49%	Beaumont						

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
using data from the
November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
601	50-809	50809	887	423	293	80.7%	Double Board	0	-113	-11%							
602	50-818	50818	901	374	366	82.1%	Double Board	0	-99	-10%							
603	50-824	50824	1381	442	758	86.9%		381	0	38%	Cherry Valley						
604	51-001	51001	1404	643	395	73.9%		404	0	40%	Banning						
605	51-004	51004	750	324	275	79.9%		0	-250	-25%	Banning						
606	51-010	51010	2401	663	1511	90.5%		1401	0	140%	Banning						
607	51-011	51011	2284	611	1502	92.5%		1284	0	128%	Banning						
608	51-013	51013	635	271	247	81.6%		0	-365	-37%	Banning						
609	51-014	51014	1083	442	427	80.2%		83	0	8%							
610	51-018	51018	1463	650	436	74.2%		463	0	46%	Banning						
611	51-020	51020	730	345	157	68.8%		0	-270	-27%	Banning						
612	51-021	51021	761	282	301	76.6%		0	-239	-24%							
613	51-025	51025	959	414	206	64.7%		0	-41	-4%							
614	51-026	51026	699	279	207	69.5%		0	-301	-30%	Banning						
615	51-859	51859	784	365	197	71.7%		0	-216	-22%							
616	51-980	51980	854	375	181	65.1%		0	-146	-15%							
617	51-986	51986	816	476	171	79.3%		0	-184	-18%							
618	52-100	52100	793	315	257	72.1%	Double Board	0	-207	-21%							
619	52-101	52101	1240	520	397	74.0%	Double Board	240	0	24%							
620	52-104	52104	694	351	203	79.8%	Double Board	0	-306	-31%	Moreno Valley/1						
621	52-105	52105	1107	465	393	77.5%	Double Board	107	0	11%							
622	52-107	52107	1332	555	377	70.0%	Double Board	332	0	33%	Moreno Valley/1						
623	52-108	52108	660	275	176	68.3%	Double Board	0	-340	-34%	Moreno Valley/1						
624	52-109	52109	906	376	247	68.8%	Double Board	0	-94	-9%							
625	52-110	52110	705	320	216	76.0%	Double Board	0	-295	-30%	Moreno Valley/1						
626	52-112	52112	1158	479	337	70.5%		158	0	16%							
627	52-115	52115	738	289	238	71.4%		0	-262	-26%	Moreno Valley/1						
628	52-116	52116	722	314	217	73.5%	Double Board	0	-278	-28%	Moreno Valley/1						
629	52-201	52201	1120	575	342	81.9%		120	0	12%							
630	52-202	52202	890	371	354	81.5%	Double Board	0	-110	-11%							
631	52-204	52204	1466	598	602	81.9%		466	0	47%	Moreno Valley/2						
632	52-207	52207	1033	484	361	81.8%		33	0	3%							
633	52-208	52208	1301	545	460	77.2%	Double Board	301	0	30%	Moreno Valley/2						
634	52-212	52212	1426	667	495	81.5%		426	0	43%	Moreno Valley/2						
635	52-213	52213	1086	558	318	80.7%	Double Board	86	0	9%							
636	52-217	52217	1524	589	554	75.0%	Double Board	524	0	52%	Moreno Valley/2						
637	52-218	52218	877	381	305	78.2%		0	-123	-12%							
638	52-219	52219	669	246	282	78.9%		0	-331	-33%	Moreno Valley/2						
639	52-220	52220	1490	611	513	75.4%		490	0	49%	Moreno Valley/2						
640	52-221	52221	1232	513	419	75.6%		232	0	23%							
641	52-301	52301	674	301	248	81.5%		0	-326	-33%	Moreno Valley/3						
642	52-304	52304	1497	624	615	82.8%		497	0	50%	Moreno Valley/3						
643	52-306	52306	1423	596	491	76.4%		423	0	42%	Moreno Valley/3						
644	52-307	52307	942	395	373	81.5%		0	-58	-6%							
645	52-310	52310	975	452	296	76.7%	Double Board	0	-25	-3%							
646	52-312	52312	963	483	286	79.9%		0	-37	-4%							
647	52-313	52313	1039	445	367	78.2%		39	0	4%							
648	52-315	52315	1673	665	653	78.8%		673	0	67%	Moreno Valley/3						
649	52-318	52318	644	312	153	72.2%		0	-356	-36%	Moreno Valley/3						
650	52-319	52319	1215	520	372	73.4%		215	0	22%							
651	52-323	52323	1001	457	332	78.8%		1	0	0%							
652	52-324	52324	1020	451	347	78.2%		20	0	2%							
653	52-325	52325	1051	487	306	75.5%		51	0	5%							
654	52-326	52326	1094	495	381	80.1%		94	0	9%							
655	52-328	52328	1269	522	468	78.0%		269	0	27%	Moreno Valley/3						
656	52-329	52329	1458	610	530	78.2%		458	0	46%	Moreno Valley/3						
657	52-332	52332	1790	663	790	81.2%		790	0	79%	Moreno Valley/3						
658	52-334	52334	919	393	256	70.6%		0	-81	-8%							
659	52-336	52336	716	354	217	79.7%		0	-284	-28%	Moreno Valley/3						
660	52-400	52400	841	365	258	74.1%	Double Board	0	-159	-16%							
661	52-401	52401	757	341	189	70.0%		0	-243	-24%							

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
 using data from the
 November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
662	52-403	52403	1180	487	361	71.9%	Double Board	180	0	18%							
663	52-405	52405	1007	442	262	69.9%		7	0	1%							
664	52-406	52406	1440	619	425	72.5%		440	0	-44%	Moreno Valley/4						
665	52-407	52407	1259	627	320	75.2%		259	0	26%	Moreno Valley/4						
666	52-411	52411	995	509	262	77.5%		0	-5	-1%							
667	52-413	52413	1184	529	333	72.8%		184	0	18%							
668	52-414	52414	597	262	158	70.4%		0	-403	-40%	Moreno Valley/4						
669	52-415	52415	788	367	196	71.4%		0	-212	-21%							
670	52-500	52500	1231	519	330	69.0%		231	0	23%							
671	52-504	52504	1444	549	526	74.4%		444	0	44%	Moreno Valley/5						
672	52-505	52505	876	350	295	73.6%		0	-124	-12%							
673	52-506	52506	906	366	284	71.7%		0	-94	-9%							
674	52-510	52510	1252	438	421	68.6%	Double Board	252	0	25%	Moreno Valley/5						
675	52-511	52511	857	353	240	69.2%		0	-143	-14%							
676	52-512	52512	699	223	200	60.5%	Double Board	0	-301	-30%	Moreno Valley/5						
677	52-516	52516	926	387	261	70.0%		0	-74	-7%							
678	52-517	52517	1234	493	363	69.4%		234	0	23%							
679	52-521	52521	719	343	162	70.2%		0	-281	-28%	Moreno Valley/5						
680	53-020	53020	1092	559	323	80.8%	Double Board	92	0	9%							
681	53-021	53021	831	389	305	83.5%	Double Board	0	-169	-17%							
682	53-023	53023	918	400	368	83.7%		0	-82	-8%							
683	54-509	54509	678	311	180	72.4%		0	-322	-32%	Elsinore						
684	55-001	55001	1093	494	323	74.7%	Double Board	93	0	9%							
685	55-002	55002	754	343	211	73.5%	Double Board	0	-246	-25%	Perris						
686	55-003	55003	1317	541	355	68.0%		317	0	32%	Perris						
687	55-004	55004	1293	542	318	66.5%	Double Board	293	0	29%	Perris						
688	55-006	55006	1053	473	223	66.1%	Double Board	53	0	5%							
689	55-011	55011	1028	447	259	68.7%		28	0	3%							
690	55-012	55012	1245	534	266	64.3%		245	0	25%	Perris						
691	55-014	55014	1353	511	387	66.4%		353	0	35%	Perris						
692	55-016	55016	913	373	191	61.8%		0	-87	-9%							
693	55-018	55018	1312	573	269	64.2%		312	0	31%							
694	55-019	55019	671	286	127	61.5%		0	-329	-33%	Perris						
695	55-020	55020	751	332	172	67.1%		0	-249	-25%	Perris						
696	55-023	55023	913	407	158	61.9%		0	-87	-9%							
697	55-025	55025	622	270	117	62.2%	Double Board	0	-378	-38%	Perris						
698	55-026	55026	858	382	263	75.2%	Double Board	0	-142	-14%							
699	55-034	55034	823	456	215	81.5%		0	-177	-18%							
700	55-035	55035	782	338	206	69.6%		0	-218	-22%							
701	55-793	55793	1118	480	307	70.4%	Double Board	118	0	12%							
702	55-854	55854	1025	391	226	60.2%	Double Board	25	0	3%							
703	55-860	55860	1204	469	240	58.9%	Double Board	204	0	20%							
704	56-913	56913	872	399	218	70.8%		0	-128	-13%							
705	56-917	56917	1143	541	329	76.1%	Double Board	143	0	14%							
706	56-919	56919	824	408	239	78.5%	Double Board	0	-176	-18%							
707	56-923	56923	741	312	237	74.1%	Double Board	0	-259	-26%	Nuevo						
708	56-930	56930	1032	485	353	81.2%		32	0	3%							
709	57-605	57605	875	335	277	69.9%		0	-125	-13%							
710	57-609	57609	1241	423	456	70.8%		241	0	24%							
711	58-005	58005	1752	685	652	76.3%	Double Board	752	0	75%	Desert Hot Spgs.						
712	58-007	58007	854	293	192	56.8%	Double Board	0	-146	-15%							
713	58-010	58010	1391	586	387	69.9%		391	0	39%	Desert Hot Spgs.						
714	58-012	58012	1303	470	297	58.9%		303	0	30%	Desert Hot Spgs.						
715	58-013	58013	716	212	132	48.0%		0	-284	-28%	Desert Hot Spgs.						
716	58-017	58017	1290	478	398	67.9%		290	0	29%	Desert Hot Spgs.						
717	58-018	58018	945	383	267	68.8%		0	-55	-6%							
718	58-826	58826	884	334	413	84.5%		0	-116	-12%							
719	58-840	58840	872	354	158	58.7%		0	-128	-13%							
720	59-010	59010	1535	585	561	74.7%		535	0	54%	Palm Springs						
721	59-011	59011	1344	604	449	78.3%		344	0	34%	Palm Springs						

Riverside County
Oversize Precinct Analysis
 using data from the
 November 2008 Election

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q
722	59-018	59018	1026	379	409	76.8%		26	0	3%							
723	59-021	59021	1577	643	635	81.0%		577	0	58%	Palm Springs						
724																	
725																	
726			792089	347975	272237			35%	over max	149	Red Zone Precincts						
727								50%	over max	69	Double Red Zone Precincts						
728								75%	over max	24	Triple Red Zone Precincts						
729								100%	over max	9	4-Star Critical Red Zone Precincts						
730								150%	over max	2	5-Star Critical Red Zone Precincts						