

1 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION  
2 FOUNDATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA  
3 MICHAEL T. RISHER (191627)  
4 (MRISHER@ACLUNC.ORG)  
5 RAUL L. MACIAS (293208)  
6 (RMACIAS@ACLUCA.ORG)  
7 39 Drumm Street, 2nd Floor  
8 San Francisco, CA 94111  
9 Telephone: (415) 621-2493  
10 Facsimile: (415) 255-8437

11 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION  
12 JULIE A. EBENSTEIN (*To Be Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
13 (JEBENSTEIN@ACLU.ORG)  
14 125 Broad Street, 17th Floor  
15 New York, NY 98164  
16 Telephone: (212) 549-2500  
17 Facsimile: (212) 549-2651

18 COOLEY LLP  
19 WILLIAM P. DONOVAN, JR.  
20 (WDONOVAN@COOLEY.COM)  
21 REBECCA L. TARNEJA (293461)  
22 (RTARNEJA@COOLEY.COM)  
23 1333 2nd Street, Suite 400  
24 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
25 Telephone: (310) 883-6400  
26 Facsimile: (310) 883-6500

27 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

PETER LA FOLLETTE; and THE  
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF  
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALEX PADILLA, in his official capacity as  
Secretary of State of the State of California;  
and WILLIAM F. ROUSSEAU, in his official  
capacity as Clerk-Recorder-Assessor-  
Registrar of Voters for the County of Sonoma,

Defendants.

No. CPF 17-515931

**DECLARATION OF KIM  
ALEXANDER IN SUPPORT OF  
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDATE**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**DECLARATION OF KIM ALEXANDER**

I, Kim Alexander, of Sacramento, California, declare as follows:

1. I am submitting this declaration in support of plaintiffs. I am over the age of 18 years and qualified to make this affidavit. I make this declaration based upon my personal knowledge, unless otherwise specified. I have no direct or indirect interest in the outcome of this case for which I am offering observations, analysis, opinions or testimony.

2. I am the founder and president of the California Voter Foundation (CVF), a nonprofit, nonpartisan 501(c)(3) organization I re-founded in 1994. CVF’s mission is to improve the voting process to better serve voters. Over the past 23 years, I have conducted numerous studies and authored or co-authored several oft-cited reports published by CVF, served on a number of voting-related task forces at the request of several California Secretaries of State, served as an invited speaker at numerous state and federal voting-related conferences and panels, and collaborated with lawmakers, election officials and advocates to improve the voting process in numerous ways.

3. Voting improvements promoted by CVF under my leadership include: 1) modernizing California campaign finance disclosure laws to require electronic filing and online disclosure of campaign and lobbying disclosure reports; 2) providing nonpartisan election information via the Internet to California voters; and 3) requiring that California ballots be backed up with a voter-verified paper trail so that votes can be accurately audited and election results verified.

4. Following the 2012 election, I became aware of the increasing number of vote-by-mail ballots that were being cast by California voters but rejected by election officials. In my own county, Sacramento, I viewed thousands of ballots in the county election office that were rejected for a number of reasons, the most common being they were received too late to be counted, or there was a problem with the voter’s signature.

5. In 2013, CVF sought and received a grant from The James Irvine Foundation to conduct a three-county study of California’s vote-by-mail system to better understand the variations

1 in how counties conduct the vote-by-mail process and the problems voters and counties experienced  
2 with that process, and to make recommendations on how to improve the vote-by-mail process so  
3 that fewer ballots from eligible voters are rejected. The three counties selected – Orange,  
4 Sacramento and Santa Cruz – varied in population size and geographic location. Election officials  
5 in each county provided me with data on past elections as well as the opportunity to visit their  
6 offices, observe vote-by-mail ballot processing, speak with administrative staff, and obtain  
7 administrative documents describing the procedures county election staff followed when  
8 processing vote-by-mail ballots. The local election official in each county also responded to a  
9 lengthy written interview request and provided me with data on vote-by-mail ballots received,  
10 counted, and rejected over four statewide elections: November 2008; November 2010; June 2012;  
11 and November 2012.

12           6.       CVF published the study’s findings in its report, “Improving California’s Vote-by-  
13 Mail Process: A Three-County Study,” in August 2014 on the CVF web site, available at  
14 <http://www.calvoter.org/votebymail> (“CVF Study”). The CVF Study focused on findings on the  
15 results of vote-by-mail balloting and rejection rates in the three counties over the four statewide  
16 elections. The CVF Study found that Orange County voters cast a total of 1,858,515 vote-by-mail  
17 ballots in these four elections, of which 13,649 were not counted, comprising a .7 percent rejection  
18 rate. Sacramento County voters cast a total of 937,157 vote-by-mail ballots in these four elections,  
19 of which 9,830 were not counted, comprising a 1.0 percent rejection rate. Santa Cruz County voters  
20 cast a total of 209,455 vote-by-mail ballots in these four elections, 1,466 of which were not counted,  
21 comprising a .7 percent rejection rate. The top three reasons why vote-by-mail ballots were rejected  
22 were because they arrived too late (61 percent), the voter’s signature was missing from the vote-  
23 by-mail identification envelope (20 percent), and the signature on the envelope was determined to  
24 not adequately compare to the voter’s voter registration signature or other signatures on file (18  
25 percent). These findings are set forth in Section 4 of the CVF Study on page 11, and are  
26 summarized in the chart below.

27 //

28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

//  
//

Reason Uncounted	Orange		Sacramento		Santa Cruz		3-county
	All elections*	Average	All elections	Average	All elections	Average	Average, all elections
Late	8,899	65%	4,752	48%	1,021	70%	61%
No signature	3,901	29%	1,627	17%	209	14%	20%
No sig compare	765	6%	3,317	34%	220	15%	18%
Other	84	1%	134	1%	16	1%	1%
<b>County Totals</b>							
Total VBM issued	2,853,265		1,380,628		285,127		4,519,020
Total received	1,858,517		937,157		209,455		3,005,129
Total received, not counted	13,649	0.7%	9,830	1.0%	1,466	0.7%	0.8%

\* "All elections" includes November 2012, June 2012, November 2010, and November 2008.

7. In addition to finding variations in the percentages of ballots rejected in the three counties, the CVF Study also documented that the percentage of ballots rejected for certain reasons also varied significantly between the three counties. For example, in Orange County, 29 percent of the uncounted ballots were rejected because voters failed to sign the vote-by-mail identification envelope; however, in Sacramento this was the rejection reason for 17 percent of the uncounted ballots and in Santa Cruz it was the reason for 14 percent of the rejected ballots. In Sacramento, 34 percent of the uncounted ballots were rejected because the signature was found to not adequately compare to the voters' signatures on file. By comparison, this was the rejection reason for just 6 percent of Orange County's uncounted ballots and 15 percent of Santa Cruz County's uncounted ballots. Late arrival was the top reason for ballot rejection across all three counties; in Santa Cruz, late arrival was the rejection reason for 70 percent of the uncounted ballots. By comparison, in Orange, late arrival was the rejection reason for 65 percent of the uncounted ballots and in Sacramento it was the rejection reason for 48 percent of the uncounted ballots.

8. One component of the CVF Study was to find out how each county determines whether vote-by-mail identification envelope signatures compare to the voter's registration signature. CVF requested and received the written procedures listing the criteria that all three counties used for verifying signatures and compared them to the criteria provided in the Uniform Vote Counting Standards published by the California Secretary of State ("Vote Counting

Standards”) which are based on procedures set forth in California’s Elections Code sections 3011 and 3019. A copy of the Vote Counting Standards is available at <http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/uniform-vote-counting-standards/>, with Section VIII specifically addressing Vote-by-Mail Voting Systems.

9. One explanation the CVF Study found for the sizeable differences between counties in terms of the number of vote-by-mail ballots rejected due to a signature mismatch is the lack of uniform statewide standards for signature comparisons. The CVF Study documented nine criteria used by the three counties studied to verify signatures, and none of these were included in the state’s uniform guidelines. Only three of these nine criteria were used by all three counties (slant of the handwriting, how letters are connected to one another, and how “t”s are crossed and “i”s are dotted). Santa Cruz was unique in utilizing criteria that asked election staff to check if the first letters in the names compare, if there is a unique lettering style, if the signatures are similar if you turn the envelope upside down, or if printing is used on both the registration card and identification envelope. Both Sacramento and Santa Cruz considered whether signatures had similar endings, with an abrupt end, long tail, or a loop back around, but Orange’s guidelines did not include these criteria. Orange County’s guidelines did include looking for other similarities in writing style, such as the way the “F”, “G”, “Y” or “Z” is formed, or the shape of cursive loops, while neither Santa Cruz nor Sacramento County featured these criteria in their guidelines. The detailed assessment of the criteria used can be found in Section 13 of the CVF Study, and is summarized in the chart below.

<b>Guidelines address what to look at when comparing signatures</b>	<b>Orange</b>	<b>Sac.</b>	<b>Santa Cruz</b>	<b>SOS</b>
Slant of the handwriting	x	x	x	
How letters are connected to one another	x	x	x	
How “t”s are crossed and “i”s are dotted	x	x	x	
Similar endings (abrupt end, long tail, loop back around)		x	x	
Do the first letters in the names compare?			x	
Is there a unique lettering style?			x	
Are the signatures similar if you turn the envelope upside down?			x	
Printing on the registration card and ID envelope			x	
Other similarities of writing style, such as the way “F”, “G”, “Y” or “Z” is formed, or the shape of cursive loops.	x			

1 //  
2 //

Guidelines address what to do if...	Orange	Sac.	Santa Cruz	SOS
Initials are substituted for any part of signature	x	x	x	x
Use of a mark instead of written signature	x		x	x
Use of a rubber stamp instead of written signature	x		x	
Only part of the signature is there	x			
Signature includes middle and last names, but not first	x			
Signature uses married/maiden name	x			
Signature compares to the spouse's signature			x	
Signature appears somewhere other than the designated place				x
ID envelope has a printed name; affidavit has written signature				x

10 10. Additionally, the CVF Study found that the three counties also varied in their  
11 signature verification instructions regarding how closely the signature on the vote-by-mail  
12 identification envelope must match the one on file. For example, Orange County’s instructions  
13 indicate that “There may be variations on a voter’s signature” but did not specifically state in its  
14 signature verification guidelines that signatures don’t have to be an exact “match.” Both  
15 Sacramento and Santa Cruz Counties’ verification instructions included the clear statements that  
16 “The operative word is compare” and “The signatures do not have to be an exact match” (CVF  
17 Study, page 49).

18 11. The CVF Study also asked the three county registrars to describe the training  
19 provided to staff regarding how to verify signatures, finding that two of the counties had sought  
20 and received guidance from a county sheriff’s office and one had not. Santa Cruz election workers  
21 had received training from their sheriff’s office that taught them to look at pen marks and the  
22 impression of a pen, but that advice was not included in the written instructions for checking  
23 signatures. Like Santa Cruz, Orange County had also consulted with a local sheriff’s department  
24 to receive additional training and advice about signature verification. Orange County invited  
25 representatives from the Los Angeles Sheriff’s Office to come and teach the agency’s staff how to  
26 verify signatures. The consultation changed the signature comparison process in Orange County  
27 and resulted in more vote-by-mail ballots being rejected because of signatures being found to not  
28 adequately compare. Though the Los Angeles Sheriff’s Office staff reportedly did not continue to

1 come to Orange County each subsequent election, its election office stated that one of its own staff  
2 members taught a class to all election workers participating in signature verification based upon  
3 the initial training provided by the Los Angeles Sheriff's Office.

4 12. As detailed in the CVF Study, there are some common challenges in signature  
5 comparison and verification practices faced by county election staff. One common challenge  
6 identified is the comparison between a "wet" signature made with a pen on a piece of paper (such  
7 as a vote-by-mail identification envelope) and a screen-captured signature made with a stylus. The  
8 latter type of signature was referred to by election staff as a "Sharpie" signature since its wider lines  
9 resembled someone using a Sharpie pen to make their signature. These "Sharpie" signatures can  
10 result from a person using the state's online voter registration system, which appends the  
11 registration applicant's signature from his or her Department of Motor Vehicles driver's license to  
12 the voter registration application. If the applicant's DMV signature was created using a stylus, that  
13 person's official signature of record with the elections department is a "Sharpie" signature, and can  
14 end up looking very different from his or her "wet" signature made with a pen on paper.

15 13. Another reason why a voter's signature may not adequately compare to the one on  
16 file is because a person's signature can change over time. If someone registers to vote as a teen but  
17 doesn't actually begin voting until he is in his twenties, those signatures can look very different.  
18 The signature of someone who has lived at the same address for many years and therefore has no  
19 need to reregister to vote may also change over time. The challenge for voters in providing  
20 verifiable signatures on vote-by-mail identification envelopes is complicated by the fact that there  
21 is no simple way to show a voter what his or her signature on file looks like without the voter  
22 visiting the elections office in person and requesting to view it.

23 14. Finally, mistakes and errors can lead to a signature mismatch. For homes with more  
24 than one vote-by-mail voter, voters sometimes accidentally mix up their identification envelopes,  
25 not realizing that it is an identification envelope coded to each particular voter. Election officials  
26 interviewed for the CVF Study report that they can often detect this reason for a non-match by  
27 looking at all the signatures in a voter's household (page 50). In cases where two voters' ballots  
28

1 are returned in one another's identification envelopes, election officials are able to "marry up" the  
2 ballots with the correct envelope and count the ballots. However, the law does not require that  
3 election officials investigate non-matches resulting from this mistake.

4 15. The CVF Study asked the three counties whether they provided voters with  
5 mismatched signatures the same opportunity to correct their signature as voters with missing  
6 signatures.

7 16. For those vote-by-mail identification envelopes with missing signatures, all three  
8 counties reported that they voluntarily conducted outreach to voters whose signatures were missing  
9 and asked them to provide a signature by Election Day so that their ballots could be counted. At  
10 the time of the CVF Study, there was no simple way for a county to collect a missing signature; the  
11 only options were to ask the voter to come to the office and sign the vote-by-mail identification  
12 envelope, or mail the identification envelope with the ballot inside of it back to the voter and ask  
13 that it be signed and returned. Each county took a different approach: Orange County sent a letter  
14 to voters asking them to come to the office and sign their identification envelope; Sacramento  
15 County tried phoning or emailing such voters if they had their contact information and asked them  
16 to come in and sign; if the voter couldn't be reached, Sacramento mailed the entire identification  
17 envelope and ballot back to the voter to sign. Santa Cruz mailed back the entire ballot and  
18 identification envelope, unless the unsigned envelope was received within a week of the election,  
19 in which case the election staff would try contacting the voter by phone or mail.

20 17. While all three counties attempted to collect missing signatures from voters before  
21 the Election Day deadline in order for their ballots to be counted, only one of the three counties  
22 attempted to collect new signatures from voters whose signatures had been found to not adequately  
23 match. Only Santa Cruz County contacted voters with mismatched signatures prior to Election Day  
24 to attempt to collect a new, matching signature so that the voters' ballots could be counted. In  
25 contrast, Sacramento and Orange counties sent out mailings to voters with mismatched signatures  
26 after the election (and after the ballot had not been counted) informing them that their signature did  
27

28



1 not adequately compare and requesting that they update their registration record with a new  
2 signature.

3 18. Additionally, I have personally witnessed the confusion caused by unclear and  
4 ambiguous guidelines for how to compare signatures on a vote-by-mail ballot. In November 2014,  
5 Sacramento voters cast ballots in one of the most competitive congressional races in the country  
6 that year. The election night results were close and with tens of thousands of vote-by-mail ballots  
7 to be counted in the days after the election, it was clear to election watchers that the outcome would  
8 be determined based on those ballots. One candidate's campaign observers were accused of  
9 challenging numerous signatures in a way that led some observers to believe the challenges were  
10 based on the voter's surname or zip code. The excessive challenges resulted in several news stories  
11 that brought a halt to the challenges. But the incident highlighted how, due to the non-standardized  
12 nature of the signature match determination, the process of signature verification can potentially be  
13 politicized in ways that can result in voter disenfranchisement.

14 19. Following the publication of the CVF Study I worked with state lawmakers to enact  
15 Assembly Bill 477, authored by Assemblyman Kevin Mullin, into law. AB 477 went into effect in  
16 January, 2016 and permits, but does not require, counties to collect missing signatures from voters  
17 separately from the ballot identification envelope and gives voters the right to provide a missing  
18 signature for a vote-by-mail ballot up to eight days after the election. Voters are not likely to know  
19 if their signature is missing and their ballot is likely to be rejected unless their registrar informs  
20 them. This year, I contacted all three counties that were part of the CVF Study to find out whether  
21 they utilized this new law and its effect. All three counties - Santa Cruz, Sacramento and Orange -  
22 voluntarily implemented AB 477 in their June and November 2016 elections. The county election  
23 staff sent form letters to voters with missing signatures and asked them to provide a signature and  
24 send it back to the county so it could be appended to their ballots, their ballots signature deficiency  
25 cured and their ballots counted. The county registrars of voters shared with me the following notice  
26 and cure rates:

27 Orange County  
28

1 Primary 2016 Number of voters contacted with missing signatures: 1,887  
2 Number of signatures collected and ballots cured: 837  
3 Cure rate: 44%

4 General 2016 Number of voters contacted with missing signatures: 2,549  
5 Number of signatures collected and ballots cured: 1,632  
6 Cure rate: 64%

7 Sacramento County

8 Primary 2016 Number of voters contacted with missing signatures: 912  
9 Number of signatures collected and ballots cured: 479  
10 Cure rate: 53%

11 General 2016 Number of voters contacted with missing signatures: 1,285  
12 Number of signatures collected and ballots cured: 794  
13 Cure rate: 62%

14 Santa Cruz County

15 Primary 2016 Number of voters contacted with missing signatures: 67  
16 Number of signatures collected and ballots cured: 17  
17 Cure rate: 25%

18 General 2016 Number of voters contacted with missing signatures: 93  
19 Number of signatures collected and ballots cured: 23  
20 Cure rate: 25%

21 20. In addition, I asked the Registrar of Voters from a fourth county, Shasta, about its  
22 notice and cure rates. Shasta conducted outreach to all voters who had challenged vote-by-mail  
23 ballots, due to missing signatures, signature mismatches or other issues that caused a challenge,  
24 and gave voters the opportunity to correct their ballots in time for them to be cured and counted.

25 Shasta County

26 Primary 2016 Number of vote-by-mail ballots with missing signatures: 57  
27 Number of voters contacted for all ballot challenges: 161 (of which 57 were  
28 missing signatures)  
Number of challenged ballots that were corrected: 92  
Cure rate: 57%

General 2016 Number of vote-by-mail ballots with missing signatures: 103  
Number of voters contacted for all ballot challenges: 338 (of which 103  
were missing signatures)  
Number of challenged ballots that were corrected: 192  
Cure rate: 57%


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

21. The overall cure rate for these four counties in the 2016 General Election was therefore 62% (2,641 voters cured out of 4,265 that were contacted).

22. The above data rates suggest that a substantial percentage of voters who are notified of a ballot signature deficiency and given the opportunity to cure the deficiency will do so to have their ballot counted.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at SACRAMENTO, CA on this 21<sup>ST</sup> day of December, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kim D. Alexander  
President, California Voter Foundation