

Stefan Sharkansky
February 3, 2006
Page 2

RESPONSE:

On September 30, 2005, you submitted a public disclosure request via e-mail.

On October 7, 2005, we responded, explaining that along with your other public record requests, we would devote time and resources to your request to fully respond as soon as reasonably possible. Further, we explained that due to the upcoming General Election in 2005, we would begin working on your request after the General Election certification in the first week of December 2005.

On December 1, 2005, you submitted two public records requests.

On December 8, 2005, we responded, explaining that we required at least another four weeks to complete your request and would keep you updated of our progress.

On December 9, 2005, 4:13 p.m., you submitted an e-mail, asking us to "reconsider the estimated timeframe for producing the requested documents."

On December 22, 2005, we sent you a fax indicating that your requested materials were available for you to pick up in our office.

On December 22, 2005, you personally came to our office and paid for the materials, which included 4 CD files and document copies. However, you rejected a document copy of the Batch Accountability Spreadsheet for November 8, 2005, General and Special Elections. We did not charge you for the cost of the materials you rejected.

On January 4, 2006, 1:38 p.m., you sent an e-mail and indicated "some of the deficiencies in the produced documents."

On January 10, 2006, we sent you a response and indicated that a CD of the batch accountability data in Excel format was available in our office for you to pick up. We also indicated that we would ask our technical staff to review the transaction logs which were provided to you on December 22, 2005.

On February 1, 2006, after consulting with our technical staff, we provided you with an explanation about the transaction logs.

Stefan Sharkansky
February 3, 2006
Page 3

Your February 2, 2006 e-mail expresses that our "response on the transaction logs is not acceptable." I have consulted our technical staff and they wish to emphasize that the field names you requested have been provided to you. The tables provided to you include all related transactions. Transaction logs are complete and correspond with the transaction field names.

To illustrate one example: in your December 1, 2005, 1:28 p.m. e-mail, you requested: "d) Absentee voter table, including at least the following information on all absentee ballots issued and returned: voter_id, av_election_id, batch number, sequence number, return date, challenge code and last transaction date; as an Access file or other electronic form readable by Access."

On December 22, 2005, we provided you with a CD file, "Absentee Table" which had the following fields:

- av_election_id
- election_id
- voter_id
- sequence
- precinct
- consolidation
- category
- source
- care_of
- mail_street
- mail_city
- mail_state
- mail_country
- mail_zip
- date_entered
- date_issued
- date_issued 2
- date_issued 3
- date_returned
- challenge
- return_source
- batch
- envelope
- av_election_tran
- ltd
- verified

Stefan Sharkansky
February 3, 2006
Page 4

The "Absentee Transaction Table" provided to you on this CD includes the following fields:


- av_election_id
- av_election_tran
- field
- type
- before
- after
- trans_date
- login
- trans_action

In conclusion, all requested numbered items in your December 1, 2005 e-mail have been provided to you on the CDs and documents you picked up from our office on December 22, 2005.

We have provided you with timely responses and have provided you with materials and documents responsive to all your specific requests, as outlined above.

I trust this clarifies the matter.

Sincerely,


Dean C. Logan
Director

cc: Janine Joly, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney