

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Tagpenner [tagpenner@comcast.net]

Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 10:38 PM

To: Tuck, Amy K.

Subject: :Paper Ballots

The thermal paper rolls connected to machines are NOT a separate verified paper ballot... It will print the same thing as the machine. It is NOT independent. Please reject this rule and pass independent paper ballots that can be counted if necessary

Thank you, Barbara Tag

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Jeff & Karen Allstadt [allstadt@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 10:44 PM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Subject: voter verified paper ballots

Hi,

We need independently voter verified paper ballots, NOT simple thermal paper reproduction of a potentially flawed electronic record, for our voting systems. Anything less potentially leads to more of the same 'gaming the system' that has been taking place.

Please make sure our politicians do the right thing this one time, it's the cornerstone of our representative republic.

Thank you,
Jeff and Dr. Karen Allstadt
Orange Park, FL

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Linda Levin [breathe123@earthlink.net]

Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 10:45 PM

To: Tuck, Amy K.

Subject: no thermal paper

I worked in the health care industry for years and JCAHO does not consider thermal paper an acceptable method of storage. It fades. No record. Why should our voting record be less secure than our medical records?

Let's make Florida an example of what can be done correctly in elections. It will take a lot to convince the rest of the U.S. after our past several elections. Mistake after mistake; both incompetence and faulty equipment.

Isn't it time to get it right?

*Linda Levin
26181 Paysandu Dr.
Punta Gorda, FL 33983*

3/17/2007

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Marion Mendelson [marionm8@juno.com]

Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 10:57 PM

To: Tuck, Amy K.

Subject: Paper trail voting

Secretary of State Browning is willing to allow a paper voting system that can not produce verified paper trails. Please do not support his bill. Hasn't the situation in District 13 been enough of a signal that it is essential to be able to verify votes?

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Marion Mendelson

Venice, FL 34293

941 492-5091

Matthews, Maria I.

From: patricia lechaton [patle01@msn.com]

Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 10:52 PM

To: Tuck, Amy K.

Cc: Matthews, Maria I.

Subject: Verified Voting

As a citizen who makes every effort to be an informed voter, it is reasonable for me to expect the best possible voting processes as well as a means of verification.

A thermally sensitive roll of paper where the paper's image fades and the roll jams, and that records my vote before its final process step does not meet any reasonable standard of proper voter requirements.

The State of Florida can do much better, and indeed its voters deserve much better. This is a great opportunity for Florida to take the lead, and to show the rest of the country that we take voting rights seriously by righting the systems that voters are losing confidence in. I hope you will avail yourselves of this opportunity.

Sincerely,
Patricia Lechaton
Englewood, FL

3/17/2007

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Verna Safran [verna325@juno.com]
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 10:59 PM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Cc: Matthews, Maria I.
Subject: Let's get one thing straight!

Dear Amy Tuck,

This is to let you know that proposed rule 1S5.002 calling for thermal paper roll printers on DRE touchscreen machines in elections is NOT the same thing as a voter verified paper trail. It just prints out mistakes.

Please do the right thing and let the voters have their votes count in a legitimate way for a change.

Sincerely,

Verna Safran Tomasson
Sarasota

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Ronald Martin [ronmartindem@webtv.net]
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 11:01 PM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Subject: the proposed rule change to verifiable paper trail

Please don't change anything in this bill leave it like it is. no thermal imaging or anything like that. When will all of yall get it and do what the people of florida want and need , it seems that all of the state leaders want nothing change and with 2008 right around the corner its of importance to have a way to recount a close elction we sure don't want another election like the one of 2000.

Yours Truly
Ron Martin
825 S Houston Ave
Ft Meade Fl 33941

Matthews, Maria I.

From: bonnyjean1229@aol.com

Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 11:22 PM

To: Tuck, Amy K.

Cc: Maria Matthews

Do not accept IS-5.002 Jeanne McIntyre

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free from AOL at AOL.com.

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Susette Bryan [galaxypoet@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 11:42 PM
To: Matthews, Maria I.
Subject: Fw: Proposed Rule 15 - 5.002

Susette Bryan

----- Original Message -----

From: Susette Bryan
To: AKTuck@dos.state.fl.us
Cc: mimatthews@dos.state.fl.us
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 10:40 PM
Subject: Proposed Rule 15 - 5.002

I am TOTALLY opposed to this.

The "audit records" that are in this bill are NOT voter verified paper ballots.

An INDEPENDENT record is needed, not a thermal paper roll that can jam, fade, and is vulnerable for programming errors or tampering.

This is extremely short-sighted and would be a huge, expensive mistake.

Susette Bryan - galaxypoet@comcast.net
1894 Killdeer Ct.
Venice, FL 34293 (941) 496-8668

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Rosemarie Myerson [romyerson@comcast.net]

Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 11:44 PM

To: Matthews, Maria I.

Subject: No thermal paper DRE records as legal ballots

It is unwise to allow thermal paper to be considered as the check for DRE tallies. This paper is known to tear, it is sensitive to heat conditions, people rarely check what is on these records. We must only have asballots records with ink that does not fade. Rosemare Myerson 1299 N. Tamiami Tr #521, SARasota, FL 34236

Matthews, Maria I.

From: ROBERT MENDELSON [2aceman@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, March 16, 2007 11:44 PM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Cc: Matthews, Maria I.
Subject: Proposed Rule 1S-5.002

These proposed "audit records" are not voter verified paper ballots. They are cheap budget thermal paper garbage. Stop messing around and get us a real verifiable voting system/

R.H.Mendelson
708 Palmetto Dr
Venice, FL 34293

3/17/2007

Matthews, Maria I.

From: ladyjustice333@earthlink.net
Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 12:00 AM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Subject: NO SSSSSSHORT CUTS ON VOTING.

WE NEED VERIFIABLE PAPER BALLOTS THAT INSURES A SAFE VOTE FOR EACH AND EVERY VOTER
Elaine N. Ramey Kissimmee,FL.

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Barb [otrbarbinpeace@comcast.net]

Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 12:02 AM

To: Tuck, Amy K.

Cc: Matthews, Maria I.

Subject: thermal rolls /toilet paper rolls

Please vote against proposed rule 1s-5.002. It would okay thermal scanners. These are not true voter verified paper ballots. They are not independant of the problematic software. And they have a history of being problematic independant of the voting machines. And federal bill HR 811 , when passed, will ban them- so buying them would be more money (paper) down the toilet.

Thank you, Barbara Laxon

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Lawrence & Daniels [lawrdans@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 12:05 AM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Cc: Matthews, Maria I.
Subject: proposed Rule 1S-5.002

I am writing to express my deep concern about and opposition to Proposed Rule 1S-5.002.

What the State of Florida desperately needs is to **ban** DRE's, not retrofit them with printers that will generate - if they work effectively at all - useless rolls of paper. This is no substitute for a paper ballot, which our Governor and other political leaders have finally realized is needed and have promised in order to restore voting integrity and voter confidence.

The retrofitted printers are costly; they are mechanically unreliable; they jam; they run out of paper and pollworkers often fail to notice; studies have shown that 50% of voters do not even check their votes against these printed so-called 'ballots,' and even if they should attempt to do so it is a futile exercise since the whole ballot cannot be displayed at one time for review. Finally, I can't even imagine using these paper rolls to try to recount and 'verify' an election.

Retrofitting DRE's with printers is a total waste of taxpayer monies and sheer folly. We need an optical scan system, with *real* paper ballots. This proposal is at best an insult to the citizens of Florida; at worst, a total scam.

Bonnie Daniels
Miami, FL 33176

Matthews, Maria I.

From: ELAINEFOX@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 12:08 AM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Cc: Matthews, Maria I.
Subject: Concerns

I am very concerned about proposed Rule 1S-5.002. The voters of Sarasota County voted to have a VERIFIED paper trail, not more of the same by adding a printer with the same results. Adding a printer to ineffective machines doesn't correct the problems. I want you to stop the voting fraud in Florida once and for all. It would be nice if people here felt that their votes counted. In this County, it is very questionable. Please do what you can to honor the democratic system of our voters and provide the integrity of optimal scanning machines to fix the problem. Sincerely, Elaine C. Fox, Nokomis, FL
941-966-4704.

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free from AOL at AOL.com.

3/17/2007

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Rita Ferrandino [rita@arccd.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 12:12 AM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Cc: mimatthews@dos.state.fl.us.
Subject: Proposed Rule 1S-5.002

I am **opposed** to the Proposed Rule 1S-5.002 which will legitimize continuous roll thermal paper printers for DRE (Direct Recording Electronic) touchscreen voting machines, and establishes the "paper audit record" from such printers as an official ballot, along with the "marksense" ballots from optical scanners.

Federal bill HR811 which is being fast tracked through the U.S. Congress will ban the use of these "toilet paper roll" style printers. I'd hate to have us waste taxpayer dollars to promote them, knowing that many people in Congress oppose them, and will likely ban them from future use.

Sincerely,
Rita Ferrandino

Rita Ferrandino
Principal, Arc Capital Development
941-921-1663 781-690-1555 Cell

The information contained in this e-mail message may be privileged, confidential, and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, any further disclosure or use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. If you think that you have received this e-mail message in error, please delete it and notify the sender.

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Marty Ward [marty@go-nci.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 12:16 AM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Cc: Matthews, Maria I.
Subject: Stop Rule 1S-5.002

Dear Sec of State Browning:

From a commuter programmer's point of view, any count done from a continuous printer attached to the voting machine is a programmers' dream. They can easily hijack our Democracy by: heating the roll and all votes being lost, it can be rolled back and blanked out and all records lost, and it can be rewritten. Thank you for protecting the citizens of Florida by not allowing these "toilet paper rolls " to be used on voting machines.

Thank you also for ensuring our elections by demanding random audits BEFORE the election is certified.

Thank you for your continued concern for the citizens of Florida.

Marty Ward

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Lawrence & Daniels [lawrdans@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 12:21 AM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Cc: Matthews, Maria I.
Subject: Proposed Adm. Rule 1S-5.002

Please note my complete opposition to this attempt to legitimate the paper product of DRE printers. It is sheer folly, and insulting to the intelligence of all Florida voters, to call this a *paper ballot*.

Adam Lawrence
Miami, FL

Matthews, Maria I.

From: charles W. Smith [cwssystem@WFECA.NET]
Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 12:31 AM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Cc: Matthews, Maria I.
Subject: Printers on DRE's
Attachments: Charles W. Smith.vcf

I do not consider a printer attached to a machine that records and tallies votes to be a valid "paper trail" or "ballot". Attaching continuous roll printers to a DRE machine will just cause a perpetuation about the doubts of the accuracy of our voting systems. Only a paper ballot, hand marked, and a verified count before election certification will tend to minimize the doubts of the voters about the accuracy of our vote tallying methods. So long as stored program technology is used to tally votes, there will continue to be doubts about the security of the vote tallies by much of the voting public. Resistance to eliminating stored program technology will only increase the public's doubts about the integrity of our elections, and present a grave danger to democracy itself, and the eventually national tranquility.

Charles Smith
2692 East-West Parkway
Bonifay, FL 32425
850-547-2045

Matthews, Maria I.

From: TechyT [techyt2002@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 2:03 AM
To: Tuck, Amy K.; Matthews, Maria I.
Subject: Fwd: Thermal paper? No! Please use common sense

TechyT <techyt2002@yahoo.com> wrote:

Date: Fri, 16 Mar 2007 22:53:40 -0700 (PDT)
 From: TechyT <techyt2002@yahoo.com>
 Subject: Thermal paper? No! Please use common sense
 To: AKTuck@dos.state.fl.us, mimatthews@dos.state.fl.us.

An intermediate computer user or anyone who collects receipts or has used thermal paper copiers from the past, completely understands that thermal copies are subject to EZ destruction and defacing. Thermal paper printers are NOT acceptable in the voting process. YOU NEED HARD COPIES! Why is Florida attempting to pander to the suppliers?

It is time to find an alternative to the poorly designed concepts introduced by ES & S and Diebold... I witnessed their presentation on Sarasota Access TV Channel 19. What a joke.

It is time to turn to the Florida universities for 'open source' code and hard copies of the ballots. The code is n+1 ... the format

You MUST vote for

Candidate A ___
 Candidate B ___
 NO VOTE ___ (records the under vote).

Its that simple and the million\$ ALREADY wasted and the non-answers introduced by the current manufacturers are NOT an acceptable FIX or path to a secure voting future.

Florida will continue to be the laughing stock. Wait till you try to do recounts with thermal paper... is ANYONE practicing common sense?

Thank you for your immediate consideration!

Again, thermal paper will NOT work...and it doesn't take a rocket scientist to see thermal paper invites a continued nightmare for Florida voters!

T. Penn

Be a PS3 game guru.

Get your game face on with [the latest PS3 news and previews at Yahoo! Games.](#)

Matthews, Maria I.

From: matthew reynolds [matthew@cadanoche.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 5:39 AM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Cc: mimatthews@dos.state.fl.us.
Subject: Voter Verified Paper Trails

Hi,

Having been involved in elections verification for some time now, and being in the heart of the "problem county" 2006, Sarasota, I have a grave concern with the proposed rule allowing thermal printed, non voter verified records to count as a sufficiently valid record.

NO! this is not something for half measures. My vote, and the votes of all the people of florida, are worth counting correctly and verifiably. This rule does not do the job.

thank you.

matthew reynolds
941.323.5122 cell
<http://cadanoche.com>

The cost of living has not affected it's popularity.

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Maureen McCully Winograd [momccully@earthlink.net]
Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 6:12 AM
To: Matthews, Maria I.
Subject: Rule 1S-5.002

Rule 1S-5.002 does NOT provide for verifiable voting in the State of Florida. How many times must our State make the National news for not being able to verify its voting? How many people do we need to disenfranchise before our government officials take responsible action and insist on a verifiable paper ballot process? The new Governor promised us paper ballots so our voting process could have integrity. Rule 1S-5.002 does not produce voter verifiable paper ballots and should be defeated. Any government action taken that is short of a verifiable paper ballot is irresponsible.

Mo Winograd
Bonita Springs, FL

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Gina Malcomson [nfn15774@naples.net]
Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 7:39 AM
To: Tuck, Amy K.
Cc: Matthews, Maria I.
Subject: Rule 1S-6.002

Basically, Proposed Rule 1S-5.002 legitimizes continuous roll thermal paper printers for DRE (Direct Recording Electronic) touchscreen voting machines, and establishes the "paper audit record" from such printers as an official ballot, along with the "marksense" ballots from optical scanners.

Note: These "audit records" are NOT voter verified paper ballots.

- a) Printers on Dress produce a machine generated record that is not independent of the voting machines. There is no guarantee that the machine accurately records what is printed on the attached paper roll.
- be) Thermal paper rolls have a history of jamming, use ink that fades over time or when subjected to heat or sunlight, and are another point of vulnerability for programming errors or tampering in an already flawed system (Dress).
- c) Federal bill HR811 now being touted as on a fast track through the UP.S. Congress, bans the use of these "toilet paper roll" style printers. It would be a waste of taxpayers' money to promote them, knowing that many people in Congress oppose them, and will likely ban them from future use.

Gina Malcomson
Full time Floridian Resident
Registered Voter

Matthews, Maria I.

From: Richard Porter [RPorter913@Comcast.net]

Sent: Saturday, March 17, 2007 7:41 AM

To: Matthews, Maria I.

I support paper ballots

~~~~~

Richard Porter

"When one knows nothing it's forever.

All knowledge leads to further obscurities".

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** mdematto@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 7:42 AM  
**To:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** Proposed Rule 1S-5.002

Proposed Rule 1S-5.002 is an UNACCEPTABLE means of establishing a voter paper trail in our state.

Thank you,

Melanie De Matto  
Aventura, FL

---

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free from AOL at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com).

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** DJ2790@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 8:26 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Subject:** Paper Ballots.

The past has proven, in many states, but especially in Florida that voting machines can and were tampered with. They also are unreliable. Please allow paper balloting to return to Florida.

Thank You, Daniel Jenkins; 341 25th ST SW; Naples, FL 34117.

---

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free from AOL at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com).

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Ellen S. Fedder [esfedder@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 8:37 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** Proposed Rule 1S-5.002

**To All Concerned:**

**Since the idea of thermal paper is totally wrong to correct our voting problem because this type of equipment jams easily and often. I sincerely hope you will throw this out as an apparent attempt to "fix" the voters' concerns here in Florida.**

**Also, we need a copy of our votes that is independent of the machines. This Rule will not serve the main purpose of making sure that all votes are counted correctly in case of an error or recount proves necessary.**

**Let it be noted that Federal bill HR811 bans the use of these types of printers.**

**It is time to make sure the voters of Florida are served properly by the right kind of machines for counting "all" of the votes cast in an election. It is a very sad story down here in Congressional District 13 in Sarasota County that there were errors known to the maker of the machines and never addressed by Kathy Dent, our Supervisor of Elections.**

**Please make sure that the proper machines are selected in the future and that no quick fix is instituted instead.**

**Sincerely,**

**Ellen S. Fedder  
3590 Mistletoe Lane  
Longboat Key, FL 34228**

**[esfedder@comcast.net](mailto:esfedder@comcast.net)**

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Gunnar Broms [gbbroms@lightningspeed.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 8:45 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** proposed Rule 1S-5.002

**I support the Governor - that only PAPER BALLOTS be used for permanently recording voting records and that no printers be used for DRE's, touch screen voting machines.**

**I submit my request to prevent passage of PROPOSED RULE 1S-5.002**

**g.broms**

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Roy Ingham [drroyjohn@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 8:45 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Subject:** Fair elections

I strongly oppose the rule-1S-5001-propopsing to make the print outs from touch screen machines acceptable as a verified paper trail. This in not a separate, individually maarked paper ballot to be counted independently from the machines products. The proposed rule would merely put the voting process back where it was- one in which their is little voter's confidence, and we will witness further legal battles over the election outcomes in the future. All this can reasonably be avoided by going to verified paper ballots.

Roy Ingham

230 Southwinds Dr.

Sarasota, Fl 34231

---

[Get a FREE Web site, company branded e-mail and more from Microsoft Office Live!](#)

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Katherine Mussard [kmussard@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 8:46 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** Ballot

Please vote against Proposed Rule 1S-5.002. We cannot tolerate touchscreen voting machines.

3/17/2007

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Sandra Brown [scbnaples@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 8:46 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** Proposed Rule 1S-5.002

I am concerned about the above proposed rule which would permit thermal paper rolls.

Florida needs to position itself as a leader in accurate elections and thermal paper is not the way to go. I believe I read that U.S.Congress is expected to oppose use of thermal paper rolls.

**I agree with Governor Crist.**

Please be certain Florida establishes a voter verified paper audit record.

**Please oppose Rule 1S-5.002.**

Thank you.

Sandra C. Brown  
975 Fountain Run  
Naples, FL 34119

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Dabonich@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 8:51 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** mimatthrs@dod.state.fl.us  
**Subject:** Please consider what you are doing about voter verified paper ballots!

These toilet paper style do not guarantee that the machine records accurately what is printed on the attached role

Thermal papers can jam, ink fade in time, heat and sunlight.

These are NOT voter verified paper ballots.

Fed Bill HR 811 bans the use of toilet paper type printers so they would be a waste of our, the taxpayers money.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

David & Barbara Nicholson, 922 Villeroy Greens Dr, Sun City Center, FL 33573. 813-633-9027

---

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free from AOL at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com).

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** HKollmeier@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 8:59 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** proposed Rule 1S-5.002

I strongly oppose this rule. Continuous roll thermal paper printers do not provide sound voter verification.

Harold Kollmeier  
Venice, FL

---

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free from AOL at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com).

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Michael Barfield [mbar62@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 9:04 AM  
**To:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Rule

---

From: mbar62@hotmail.com  
To: aktuck@dos.state.fl.us  
Subject: Proposed Rule  
Date: Sat, 17 Mar 2007 09:01:55 -0400

To Whom it may concern:

I am opposed to the proposed rule implementing thermal printer rolls to the DRE machines. As a citizen, I have to express concern over the implementation of this technology when the federal government is currently pushing legislation on a fast-track basis that would prohibit such technology. One of the reasons behind the federal legislation is that this technology is unreliable, prone to jam, ink-fading, and other problems. Please do not implement the proposed rule.

Michael Barfield

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** DOPTeach@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 9:17 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** (no subject)

Here are two reasons that I do not support proposed rule 1S-5.002.

- a) Printers on DREs produce a machine generated record that is not independent of the voting machines. There is no guarantee that the machine accurately records what is printed on the attached paper roll.
- b) Thermal paper rolls have a history of jamming, use ink that fades over time or when subjected to heat or sunlight, and are another point of vulnerability for programming errors or tampering in an already flawed system (DREs).

Thank you,  
Yvonne Spector  
1931 Scott St.  
Hollywood, FL 33020

---

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free from AOL at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com).

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Paula John [johnpaulag@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 9:19 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** Proposed Rule 1S-5.002

Re Proposed REule 1S-5.002

Adding a thermal-paper roll to print out voters' choices is very like appointing Lt. General Kevin Kiley to clean up the problems at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. It misses the point and is only more of the same old same old.

The problem is that we cannot trust a machine to tabulate and report the same data that it prints and/or shows on a screen.

It should be obvious that machines can malfunction and can be tampered with and can be programmed to record one thing while printing another. So we don't need a printout from the machine.

What we need is an original voter ballot that can be used to audit the machine data and to be recounted should it become necessary.

Do not give us a "paper trail" that is independent of the voter. Give us a paper ballot that the voter marks and that will always be an accurate and independent record of his or her choices.

Lt. General Kiley is gone now. Let us also retire the touch-screen machine, even with a printer attachment. It doesn't recognize the problem

Paula G. John  
3850 Wilshire Circle West  
Sarasota FL 34238  
941/927-3955.

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Dabonich2@aol.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 9:26 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** Opposal to Thermal printers

Secretary of State Kurt Browning:

Please do not use thermal continous roll printers to record our votes.

Sincerely,

David Nicholson  
922 Villeroy Greens Dr.  
Sun City Center, FL 33573  
813-633-9027

---

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free from AOL at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com).

3/17/2007

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Suzanne Ferguson [scf@cwru.edu]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 9:38 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** Optical scan ballots needed

**Please approve paper optical scan ballots for Florida, as Governor Crist has recommended. Paper trails from DREs do not solve the problem of "recountable" ballots--if the DRE doesn't work the "paper trail" is worthless.**

**sincerely**  
**Suzanne Ferguson**

Suzanne Ferguson  
5260 S. Landings Dr. #1503  
Ft. Myers, FL 33919

239-481-4871

"It is difficult / to get the news from poems / yet men die miserably every day / for lack / of what is found there." W.C. Williams

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Sharon L Simon [slsimon@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 10:01 AM  
**To:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** no thermal paper

>  
>>> The only acceptable VOTED BALLOT is a paper ballot completed by the  
>>> voter.  
>>>  
>>> Everything else, including thermal paper rolls added to DRE machines  
>>> (proposed Rule 1S-5.002) is suspect and still subject to all the  
>>> problems DRE machines give us.  
sharon simon  
delray beach, florida 33484

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Andy Opel [aopel@fsu.edu]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 10:03 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** Voting issue

Hi,

I Want to go on record as supporting an election process where the only acceptable voted ballot is a paper ballot completed by the voter. Everything else, including thermal paper rolls added to DRE machines (proposed Rule 1S-5.002) is suspect and still subject to all the problems DRE machines give us.

Please support clean elections and show the country is able to lead the nation in voting rights and security.

Sincerely,

Andy Opel

Andy Opel, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor  
Media Production Area Head  
Department of Communication  
356 Diffenbaugh Bldg.  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL 32306-1531  
W: (850) 644-8768  
C: (850) 322-3349  
[aopel@fsu.edu](mailto:aopel@fsu.edu)  
[www.andyopel.net](http://www.andyopel.net)

3/17/2007

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Arlene Montemarano [mikarl@starpower.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 10:04 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.; Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** PLEASE ATTEND TO THE NEED FOR THIS  
**Attachments:** mikarl.vcf

The only acceptable VOTED BALLOT is a paper ballot completed by the voter himself.

Everything else, including thermal paper rolls added to DRE machines (proposed Rule 1S-5.002) is suspect and still subject to all the problems DRE machines give us. This country cannot survive if we are provided only with the illusion of an honest election.

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Martin Albaum [martin@albaum.us]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 10:03 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** Proposed Rule 1S-5.002

We object to the proposed use of thermal paper as a "paper audit" of a vote. It is in no sense voter verified.

Martin Albaum and Jane Albaum  
490 North Shore Road  
Longboat Key, FL 34228

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Burt and Barbara Gleason [bbgleason@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 10:05 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.  
**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** Proposed Rule 1S-5.002

Proposed Rule 1S-5.002 is not in the best interest of the voters of Florida and should be prevented from going into effect.

Direct Recording Electronic touchscreen voting machines with thermal paper printers do not produce voter verified paper ballots.

What does Secretary of State Kurt Browning have against fair elections?

Signed, Burton J. Gleason and Barbara Gleason, 384 Marsh Creek Road, Venice FL 34292

3/17/2007

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Jack Beale [jack.beale@att.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 10:10 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.; Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** House Rule 1S-5.002 - THWARTING THE WILL OF THE VOTERS

Amy Tuck / Maria Matthews:

I have great concerns about proposed voting legislation in Florida. We, in Sarasota County, voted overwhelmingly to change from all-electronic voting systems (*DRE [Direct Recording Electronic] touchscreen voting machines*) to voting systems that utilize an "independently filled-out" paper ballot, scanned by optical readers. The independent ballot was to be the ballot of record.

I understand that there's an ill-conceived proposal (*Proposed Rule 1S-5.002*) to use a thermal-paper readout to "verify" votes cast on electronic machines. If this is so, **this is NOT ACCEPTABLE...!** There are a host of problems with thermal paper.

1. Printers on DREs produce a machine generated record that IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF THE VOTING MACHINES; THUS, THERE IS NO GUARANTEE THAT THE MACHINES ACCURATELY RECORD WHAT IS PRINTED ON THE THERMAL PAPER OUTPUT.
2. Thermal paper ink that fades very quickly and even more quickly when subjected to heat. In sunlight the ink fades in minutes
3. These add-on devices are just one more source introducing programming errors or tampering in an already flawed system (DREs).
4. Federal bill HR811 bans the use of these thermal paper style printers. It would be extremely counterproductive promote them, knowing that many people in Congress oppose them, and will likely ban them from future use.

I would like to suggest that the rules be changed to **use independently filled-out paper ballots (*the ballots of record*) that are secondarily scanned by optical readers. This is what the voters chose last year and this is what our elected officials should deliver...**

Jack Beale  
[jack.beale@att.net](mailto:jack.beale@att.net)

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Bill Bucolo [bbuc@mac.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 10:12 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.; Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** Proposed Rule 1S-5.002 NOT acceptable.

As a voting citizen of Florida who has learned about the voting systems we now use and may use in the future, I want the Division of Elections and the State of Florida Sec'y of State to know I do NOT want to continue using DRE voting machines under any circumstances.

**The only acceptable VOTED BALLOT IS A PAPER BALLOT.**

Everything else, including thermal paper rolls added to DRE machines (proposed Rule 1S-5.002) is suspect and still subject to all the problems DRE machines give us.

Thank You.

**Bill Bucolo**  
*Honest Broker for Domestic and International Video, Print and Internet Marketing*  
7401 Dartmouth Avenue North  
St. Petersburg, FL 33710

tel 727-347-1829 fax 775-248-7763 Skype BillBucolo IM bbuc2

*"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world-- indeed it's the only thing that ever has."*  
--Margaret Mead

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** jack smith [silversmi3968@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 10:12 AM

**To:** Tuck, Amy K.

**Cc:** Matthews, Maria I.

**Subject:** Touchscreen voting machines

Gentlemen, Don't compound the errors of the past with more mistakes. Touchscreen machines equipped with printers are not paper ballots! Touchscreens must go.

Jack Smith

[silversmi3968@comcast.net](mailto:silversmi3968@comcast.net)

**Matthews, Maria I.**

---

**From:** Wanda Schwerer [wschwer@tampabay.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 17, 2007 10:16 AM  
**To:** Tuck, Amy K.; Matthews, Maria I.  
**Subject:** We need paper ballots!!

The only acceptable VOTED BALLOT is a paper ballot completed by the voter. It is the least expensive, easiest to audit and highest in reliability.

Everything else, including thermal paper rolls added to DRE machines (proposed Rule 1S-5.002) is suspect and still subject to all the problems DRE machines give us. Please see the extract below from Wikipedia citing concerns about the paper audit trails added to DREs.

Regards,

*Wanda Schwerer*  
517 Belle Isle Ave  
Belleair Beach FL 33786  
Home - 727.517.1797

## Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail

### From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

(Redirected from VVPAT)  
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/VVPAT>  
Challenges and concerns with VVPAT

### Security Concerns

The introduction of malicious software into a VVPAT system can cause it to intentionally misrecord the voter's selections. This attack could be minimized by detection through manipulating only a small percentage of the votes or for only lesser known races.<sup>[8]</sup>

Another security concern is that a VVPAT could print while no voter is observing the paper trail, a form of ballot stuffing.<sup>[9]</sup> Even if additional votes were discovered through matching to the voters list, it would be impossible to identify legitimate ballots from fraudulent ballots.

Alternately the printer could invalidate the printed record after the voter leaves and print a new fraudulent ballot. These ballots would be undetectable as invalidated ballots are quite common during elections.<sup>[10]</sup> Also, VVPAT systems that are technically able to reverse the paper feed could be open to manipulated software overwriting or altering the VVPAT after the voter checks it.

### Usability and ergonomic concerns

For the voter the printed record is "in a different format than the ballot, in a different place, is verified at

a different time, and has a different graphical layout with different contrast and lighting parameters."<sup>[11]</sup> In November 2003 in Wilton, CT, virtually all voters had to be prompted to find and verify their receipt, increasing the time required to vote and the work for the pollworkers. The VVPAT adds to the complexity of voting, already a deterrent to voting.<sup>[11]</sup>

In addition, a VVPAT component may not be easily usable by poll-workers, many of whom are already struggling with DRE maintenance and use and new elections law requirements. In the 2006 primary election in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, a study found that 9.6 percent of the VVPAT tapes were either destroyed, blank, illegible, missing, taped together or otherwise compromised. In one case the thermal paper was loaded into the printer backwards leaving a blank tape.<sup>[12][13]</sup>, which was not realized by voters who couldn't verify the paper trail. The Cuyahoga Election Review Panel proposed in its final report to remove the opaque doors covering the VVPAT except the ones equipped with equipment for blind voters.<sup>[14]</sup> In general collecting and counting these printed records can be difficult.<sup>[11]</sup>

Records printed on continuous rolls of paper is more difficult than counting standard paper ballots or even punch cards.<sup>[11]</sup>

### Privacy concerns

Current VVPAT systems print the ballot records out in the order in which they were cast. Many jurisdictions also record the order in which voters vote<sup>[citation needed]</sup>, thus possibly compromising the secrecy of the vote. If there are multiple voting machines it would be more difficult to match between the full voter list and the VVPATs.

Alternately, an attacker could watch the order in which people use a particular voting system and note the order of each particular vote he is interested in. If that attacker later obtains the paper ballot records she could compare the two and compromise the privacy of the ballot. This could also lead to vote selling and voter intimidation.<sup>[15]</sup>

.....

### Reliability Concerns

VVPAT systems can also introduced increased concern over reliability. Professor Michael Shamos points out that "Adding a paper printing device to a DRE machine naturally adds another component that can fail, run out of ink, jam or run out of paper. If DREs are alleged already to be prone to failure, adding a paper trail cannot improve that record."<sup>[20]</sup> In Brazil in 2003, where a small number of precincts had installed paper trails, failure of the printers delayed voters by as much as 12 hours, a figure that would be catastrophic in the U.S.<sup>[21]</sup>

Current implementation of VVPAT systems use thermal printers to print their paper ballot records. Ballot records printed on the thermal paper will fade with time. Also, heat applied to the paper before or after the election can destroy the printing.<sup>[11]</sup>