

# **CAMBER - INITIAL ANALYSIS OF COLORADO NOVEMBER 2005 ELECTION**

## **Overview**

CAMBER's preliminary analysis of the November 2005 election is summarized below. It is intended to capture basic facts about the election and to serve as a starting point for future action.

Because the Secretary of State has made it unreasonably difficult and increasingly cost prohibitive for citizens to obtain election data, transparency has been sacrificed and citizens are obligated to rely on superficial data scraped from State and County websites and news reports.

The source of the election results is the Colorado Secretary of State's website -- November 1, 2005 Coordinated Election Official Results - Referendum C and D (November 25, 2005). Only Ref C and D election results are posted on the Secretary of State's website. The election results are reported by county and not by precinct. The report contains only total YES and NO votes that were counted for each county. There is no indication of the number of ballots issued. There is no breakdown of each vote total by voting method (absentee, early, provisional, precinct, emergency and mandatory mail ballot). Missing ballots, rejected ballots, over and under votes, and other problems are masked by the superficial report. Precinct data, including voter registration and participation is not provided. Ballot inventory information is not provided.

Each county is required to conduct an audit of their election equipment and report their results to the Secretary of State. The source we used for audit report data is the Secretary of State website. Because the data is published as images rather than tables, it is unreasonably difficult to work with. The website does not contain a table showing which voting methods and equipment were used by each county.

The combination of superficial data and non-standard formats makes it unreasonably difficult to analyze a Colorado election. One might ask, is this intentional?

## **Conclusions**

Colorado's November 2005 election results should not be trusted until they are independently verified. It is nearly certain that vote counts are not correct. Without a detailed analysis, it is not possible to know if the counting errors would reverse the election results. A few examples of why the results need to be independently verified.

1. **Boulder County:** (A) Boulder conducted a Mail Ballot Only Election because, as recorded in a public hearing, the County Commissioners believed that this would give an advantage to the Ref C proponents. Mail Ballot Elections are inherently not secure, accurate, verifiable and transparent. (B) Boulder County does not permit voters to use anonymous ballots; consequently, voters are exposed to disenfranchisement due to intimidation and vote selling. (C) Boulder County used voting equipment which suffers an acknowledged defect. Every ballot is folded, and the counting equipment can count a fold as a YES vote for Ref C. This can cause NO votes and UNDER votes to be converted to YES votes. (D) Boulder has refused to comply with the Colorado Open Records Act making it impossible to independently verify voter registration, ballot delivery, and the results of the election. (E) Boulder County's approved election and security plans contain major security and accuracy control flaws.
2. **Denver County:** (A) Denver may be one of the counties referred to in the November 1<sup>st</sup> Denver Post article that reported, "In some counties, political parties are collecting ballots at locations such as grocery stores and plan to submit them in bulk, said Dana Williams, spokeswoman for Secretary of State Gigi Dennis." Such a procedure violates the law. (B) Past experience with Denver vote counting equipment left unresolved the accuracy of the vote counting equipment.

3. **Arapahoe County:** Produced 4,941 more YES votes than NO votes. CCN Online reported, "Nancy Doty, Arapahoe County Clerk and Recorder, said there were some problems with the 2005 election but the county diligently did its best to offer everyone the opportunity to vote and is seeking to make sure the system works better in 2007. There were problems with ballots that didn't get to the voters and a number of other counties had similar problems."
4. **Park County:** Park County conducted a hand recount of 5,340 ballots which originally tallied 1,026 YES, 2,855 NO, 3 OVER and 556 UNDER votes. 471 of the over and under votes were converted to 188 YES and 284 NO votes, a net increase of 96 NO votes.
5. **Custer County:** After the official results were posted on the web, and after this report was prepared, the Custer County numbers were altered. The original 230 YES and 332 NO votes were increased to 668 YES and 885 NO votes. This is an increase of 991 votes with a net increase of 115 NO votes.
6. **Audit reports:** The results from samples used for county audits were significantly different than the official election results for the county. For example:
  - Archuleta County's sample for Ref C had 8.74 percent more NO votes than YES votes, but the official total had 6.38 percent more YES votes than NO votes.
  - El Paso County samples for Ref C had 6.78 percent more YES votes than NO votes, while the official county total had 5.58 percent more NO votes than YES votes.

The differences between sample and official results may indicate that the samples are not statistically fair samples, in which case they should not be trusted. If the samples are statistically fair, the difference between sampled and official results may indicate that the official election results are not correct.


The following pages contain an analysis of where the Ref C YES and NO votes came from, a table showing the original data and a few additional columns, and a set of tables that separates the YES voting counties from the NO voting counties.

Colorado must open its elections to independent oversight. There is inadequate attention given to security, anonymity, accuracy and transparency. There is no problem database available to the public. Published results do not include the data needed to verify election. The public must pay to get access to files containing the data.

## WHERE THE REFERENDUM C VOTES CAME FROM

The Referendum C contest sought voter permission to increase State spending. Intermediate and final results are shown in the following chart.

- Together, 62 of Colorado's 64 counties produced 10,816 more NO votes than YES votes. If that were the end of it, Ref C would have FAILED.
- Boulder County produced 23,518 more YES votes than NO votes. With these 63 of 64 counties' votes, Ref C would have PASSED by 12,702 votes.
- Denver County produced 34,973 more YES votes than NO votes. This was the "icing on the cake" for Ref C proponents. The final result, with 64 of 64 counties reporting, was that Ref C officially PASSED by 47,675 votes.



Appendix 1 shows the official number of votes counted for each county, the net difference between YES and NO votes for each county, and the RANK in net YES or NO vote production for each county. Mesa County is the highest ranking NO vote county with -11,886 net NO votes, and Denver County is the highest ranking YES vote county with 34,973 net YES votes.

Ref C had the following statewide totals:

State Totals									
County	TOTAL	YES	NO	NET	Winner	Rank	YES	NO	NET
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>1,151,893</b>	<b>599,784</b>	<b>552,109</b>	<b>47,675</b>	<b>YES</b>		<b>52.07%</b>	<b>47.93%</b>	<b>4.14%</b>

Obviously, the number of votes counted does not determine whether a contest is won or lost. It is the net difference between the number of YES votes and NO votes that determines the winner. For example, see below, Jefferson County counted votes for 165,934 voters and Elbert County counted votes for 7,393 voters. Elbert NO voters essentially erased the Jefferson county YES vote by recording 2,109 more NO votes than YES votes; Jefferson County produced only 1,340 more YES votes than NO votes. If only these two counties competed, Ref C would have FAILED by 769 votes.

County	TOTAL	YES	NO	NET	Winner	Rank	YES	NO	NET
JEFFERSON	165,934	83,637	82,297	1,340	YES	11	50.40%	49.60%	0.81%
ELBERT	7,393	2,642	4,751	-2,109	NO	6	35.74%	64.26%	-28.53%
TOTAL	173,327	86,279	87,048	-769	NO		40.71%	59.29%	-18.58%

During the Ref C contest, 28 NO-voting-counties produced 49,286 more NO votes than YES votes. Denver-Boulder produced 58,491 more YES votes than NO votes. Hypothetically, if only these 30 counties competed, Ref C would have PASSED by 9,205 votes.


County	TOTAL	YES	NO	NET	Winner	Rank	YES	NO	NET
28 NO Counties	434,078	192,396	241,682	-49,286	28		44.32%	55.68%	-11.35%
YES Denver-Boulder	202,109	130,300	71,809	58,491	2		64.47%	35.53%	28.94%
TOTAL	636,187	322,696	313,491	9,205			50.72%	49.28%	1.45%

The remaining 34 YES-voting-counties produced 38,470 more YES votes than NO votes. If only these 34 YES-voting-counties (without Denver-Boulder) competed against the 28 NO-voting-counties, Ref C would have FAILED by 10,816 votes.

County	TOTAL	YES	NO	NET	Winner	Rank	YES	NO	NET
28 NO Counties	434,078	192,396	241,682	-49,286	28		44.32%	55.68%	-11.35%
34 YES Counties	515,706	277,088	238,618	38,470	36		53.73%	46.27%	7.46%
TOTAL	949,784	469,484	480,300	-10,816			49.43%	50.57%	-1.14%

The following chart emphasizes the contribution of Denver-Boulder to the passage of Referendum C.

**Denver-Boulder defeats voters in 28 NO-voting-counties  
34 YES-voting-counties' votes were not needed**



Official Results with added columns

**NOVEMBER 1, 2005 COORDINATED ELECTION Referendum C  
OFFICIAL RESULTS by County Alphabetically**

County	TOTAL	YES	NO	NET	Winner	Rank	YES	NO	NET
ADAMS	63,271	26,974	36,297	-9,323	NO	2	42.63%	57.37%	-14.74%
ALAMOSA	4,172	2,883	1,289	1,594	YES	8	69.10%	30.90%	38.21%
ARAPAHOE	126,025	65,483	60,542	4,941	YES	4	51.96%	48.04%	3.92%
ARCHULETA	3,354	1,784	1,570	214	YES	22	53.19%	46.81%	6.38%
BACA	1,870	1,107	763	344	YES	19	59.20%	40.80%	18.40%
BENT	1,330	685	645	40	YES	35	51.50%	48.50%	3.01%
BOULDER	86,208	54,863	31,345	23,518	YES	2	63.64%	36.36%	27.28%
BROOMFIELD	12,970	6,680	6,290	390	YES	18	51.50%	48.50%	3.01%
CHAFFEE	6,798	3,216	3,582	-366	NO	14	47.31%	52.69%	-5.38%
CHEYENNE	733	274	459	-185	NO	17	37.38%	62.62%	-25.24%
CLEAR CREEK	3,713	1,789	1,924	-135	NO	21	48.18%	51.82%	-3.64%
CONEJOS	1,939	1,083	856	227	YES	20	55.85%	44.15%	11.71%
COSTILLA	1,197	678	519	159	YES	27	56.64%	43.36%	13.28%
CROWLEY	883	375	508	-133	NO	22	42.47%	57.53%	-15.06%
CUSTER	562	230	332	-102	NO	24	40.93%	59.07%	-18.15%
DELTA	10,010	3,479	6,531	-3,052	NO	5	34.76%	65.24%	-30.49%
DENVER	115,901	75,437	40,464	34,973	YES	1	65.09%	34.91%	30.17%
DOLORES	528	253	275	-22	NO	27	47.92%	52.08%	-4.17%
DOUGLAS	62,369	30,265	32,104	-1,839	NO	8	48.53%	51.47%	-2.95%
EAGLE	8,482	5,029	3,453	1,576	YES	9	59.29%	40.71%	18.58%
EL PASO	118,747	56,061	62,686	-6,625	NO	3	47.21%	52.79%	-5.58%
ELBERT	7,393	2,642	4,751	-2,109	NO	6	35.74%	64.26%	-28.53%
FREMONT	12,583	5,680	6,903	-1,223	NO	9	45.14%	54.86%	-9.72%
GARFIELD	11,599	5,527	6,072	-545	NO	13	47.65%	52.35%	-4.70%
GILPIN	1,897	800	1,097	-297	NO	16	42.17%	57.83%	-15.66%
GRAND	4,438	2,156	2,282	-126	NO	23	48.58%	51.42%	-2.84%
GUNNISON	5,084	3,561	1,523	2,038	YES	6	70.04%	29.96%	40.09%
HINSDALE	440	218	222	-4	NO	28	49.55%	50.45%	-0.91%
HUERFANO	2,238	1,151	1,087	64	YES	31	51.43%	48.57%	2.86%
JACKSON	472	148	324	-176	NO	18	31.36%	68.64%	-37.29%
JEFFERSON	165,934	83,637	82,297	1,340	YES	11	50.40%	49.60%	0.81%
KIOWA	487	287	200	87	YES	30	58.93%	41.07%	17.86%
KIT CARSON	2,175	1,067	1,108	-41	NO	26	49.06%	50.94%	-1.89%
LA PLATA	13,221	9,051	4,170	4,881	YES	5	68.46%	31.54%	36.92%
LAKE	1,473	668	805	-137	NO	20	45.35%	54.65%	-9.30%
LARIMER	79,075	45,002	34,073	10,929	YES	3	56.91%	43.09%	13.82%
LAS ANIMAS	3,911	2,416	1,495	921	YES	14	61.77%	38.23%	23.55%
LINCOLN	1,853	880	973	-93	NO	25	47.49%	52.51%	-5.02%
LOGAN	5,953	3,474	2,479	995	YES	13	58.36%	41.64%	16.71%
MESA	39,558	13,836	25,722	-11,886	NO	1	34.98%	65.02%	-30.05%
MINERAL	411	234	177	57	YES	32	56.93%	43.07%	13.87%
MOFFAT	3,303	1,475	1,828	-353	NO	15	44.66%	55.34%	-10.69%
MONTEZUMA	6,170	3,167	3,003	164	YES	26	51.33%	48.67%	2.66%

**NOVEMBER 1, 2005 COORDINATED ELECTION Referendum C  
OFFICIAL RESULTS by County Alphabetically**

<b>County</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>	<b>Winner</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>
MONTROSE	10,789	4,392	6,397	-2,005	NO	7	40.71%	59.29%	-18.58%
MORGAN	7,590	3,480	4,110	-630	NO	12	45.85%	54.15%	-8.30%
OTERO	5,024	2,533	2,491	42	YES	34	50.42%	49.58%	0.84%
OURAY	1,726	886	840	46	YES	33	51.33%	48.67%	2.67%
PARK	5,253	2,114	3,139	-1,025	NO	11	40.24%	59.76%	-19.51%
PHILLIPS	1,836	1,023	813	210	YES	23	55.72%	44.28%	11.44%
PITKIN	3,690	2,597	1,093	1,504	YES	10	70.38%	29.62%	40.76%
PROWERS	3,355	1,785	1,570	215	YES	21	53.20%	46.80%	6.41%
PUEBLO	32,828	16,823	16,005	818	YES	15	51.25%	48.75%	2.49%
RIO BLANCO	1,751	952	799	153	YES	28	54.37%	45.63%	8.74%
RIO GRANDE	3,057	1,820	1,237	583	YES	16	59.54%	40.46%	19.07%
ROUTT	6,791	4,280	2,511	1,769	YES	7	63.02%	36.98%	26.05%
SAGUACHE	1,473	830	643	187	YES	24	56.35%	43.65%	12.70%
SAN JUAN	242	166	76	90	YES	29	68.60%	31.40%	37.19%
SAN MIGUEL	1,692	1,109	583	526	YES	17	65.54%	34.46%	31.09%
SEDGWICK	1,070	621	449	172	YES	25	58.04%	41.96%	16.07%
SUMMIT	5,806	3,498	2,308	1,190	YES	12	60.25%	39.75%	20.50%
TELLER	6,161	2,550	3,611	-1,061	NO	10	41.39%	58.61%	-17.22%
WASHINGTON	1,542	773	769	4	YES	36	50.13%	49.87%	0.26%
WELD	46,129	20,256	25,873	-5,617	NO	4	43.91%	56.09%	-12.18%
YUMA	3,358	1,591	1,767	-176	NO	19	47.38%	52.62%	-5.24%
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>1,151,893</b>	<b>599,784</b>	<b>552,109</b>	<b>47,675</b>	<b>YES</b>		<b>52.07%</b>	<b>47.93%</b>	<b>4.14%</b>

Official results separated by yes-voting counties and no-voting counties

<b>28 NO Counties</b>									
<b>County</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>	<b>TOT-NET</b>	<b>WINNER</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>
MESA	39,558	13,836	25,722	-11,886	-11,886	NO	34.98%	65.02%	-30.05%
ADAMS	63,271	26,974	36,297	-9,323	-21,209	NO	42.63%	57.37%	-14.74%
EL PASO	118,747	56,061	62,686	-6,625	-27,834	NO	47.21%	52.79%	-5.58%
WELD	46,129	20,256	25,873	-5,617	-33,451	NO	43.91%	56.09%	-12.18%
DELTA	10,010	3,479	6,531	-3,052	-36,503	NO	34.76%	65.24%	-30.49%
ELBERT	7,393	2,642	4,751	-2,109	-38,612	NO	35.74%	64.26%	-28.53%
MONTROSE	10,789	4,392	6,397	-2,005	-40,617	NO	40.71%	59.29%	-18.58%
DOUGLAS	62,369	30,265	32,104	-1,839	-42,456	NO	48.53%	51.47%	-2.95%
FREMONT	12,583	5,680	6,903	-1,223	-43,679	NO	45.14%	54.86%	-9.72%
TELLER	6,161	2,550	3,611	-1,061	-44,740	NO	41.39%	58.61%	-17.22%
PARK	5,253	2,114	3,139	-1,025	-45,765	NO	40.24%	59.76%	-19.51%
MORGAN	7,590	3,480	4,110	-630	-46,395	NO	45.85%	54.15%	-8.30%
GARFIELD	11,599	5,527	6,072	-545	-46,940	NO	47.65%	52.35%	-4.70%
CHAFFEE	6,798	3,216	3,582	-366	-47,306	NO	47.31%	52.69%	-5.38%
MOFFAT	3,303	1,475	1,828	-353	-47,659	NO	44.66%	55.34%	-10.69%
GILPIN	1,897	800	1,097	-297	-47,956	NO	42.17%	57.83%	-15.66%
CHEYENNE	733	274	459	-185	-48,141	NO	37.38%	62.62%	-25.24%
JACKSON	472	148	324	-176	-48,317	NO	31.36%	68.64%	-37.29%
YUMA	3,358	1,591	1,767	-176	-48,493	NO	47.38%	52.62%	-5.24%
LAKE	1,473	668	805	-137	-48,630	NO	45.35%	54.65%	-9.30%
CLEAR CREEK	3,713	1,789	1,924	-135	-48,765	NO	48.18%	51.82%	-3.64%
CROWLEY	883	375	508	-133	-48,898	NO	42.47%	57.53%	-15.06%
GRAND	4,438	2,156	2,282	-126	-49,024	NO	48.58%	51.42%	-2.84%
CUSTER	562	230	332	-102	-49,126	NO	40.93%	59.07%	-18.15%
LINCOLN	1,853	880	973	-93	-49,219	NO	47.49%	52.51%	-5.02%
KIT CARSON	2,175	1,067	1,108	-41	-49,260	NO	49.06%	50.94%	-1.89%
DOLORES	528	253	275	-22	-49,282	NO	47.92%	52.08%	-4.17%
HINSDALE	440	218	222	-4	-49,286	NO	49.55%	50.45%	-0.91%
<b>28 NO Counties</b>	<b>434,078</b>	<b>192,396</b>	<b>241,682</b>	<b>-49,286</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>44.32%</b>	<b>55.68%</b>	<b>-11.35%</b>

<b>YES Denver-Boulder</b>									
<b>County</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>	<b>TOT-NET</b>	<b>WINNER</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>
DENVER	115,901	75,437	40,464	34,973	34,973	YES	65.09%	34.91%	30.17%
BOULDER	86,208	54,863	31,345	23,518	58,491	YES	63.64%	36.36%	27.28%
<b>YES Denver-Boulder</b>	<b>202,109</b>	<b>130,300</b>	<b>71,809</b>	<b>58,491</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>64.47%</b>	<b>35.53%</b>	<b>28.94%</b>

<b>34 YES Counties</b>									
<b>County</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>	<b>TOT-NET</b>	<b>WINNER</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>
LARIMER	79,075	45,002	34,073	10,929	69,420	YES	56.91%	43.09%	13.82%
ARAPAHOE	126,025	65,483	60,542	4,941	74,361	YES	51.96%	48.04%	3.92%
LA PLATA	13,221	9,051	4,170	4,881	79,242	YES	68.46%	31.54%	36.92%
GUNNISON	5,084	3,561	1,523	2,038	81,280	YES	70.04%	29.96%	40.09%
ROUTT	6,791	4,280	2,511	1,769	83,049	YES	63.02%	36.98%	26.05%
ALAMOSA	4,172	2,883	1,289	1,594	84,643	YES	69.10%	30.90%	38.21%
EAGLE	8,482	5,029	3,453	1,576	86,219	YES	59.29%	40.71%	18.58%
PITKIN	3,690	2,597	1,093	1,504	87,723	YES	70.38%	29.62%	40.76%
JEFFERSON	165,934	83,637	82,297	1,340	89,063	YES	50.40%	49.60%	0.81%
SUMMIT	5,806	3,498	2,308	1,190	90,253	YES	60.25%	39.75%	20.50%
LOGAN	5,953	3,474	2,479	995	91,248	YES	58.36%	41.64%	16.71%
LAS ANIMAS	3,911	2,416	1,495	921	92,169	YES	61.77%	38.23%	23.55%
PUEBLO	32,828	16,823	16,005	818	92,987	YES	51.25%	48.75%	2.49%
RIO GRANDE	3,057	1,820	1,237	583	93,570	YES	59.54%	40.46%	19.07%
SAN MIGUEL	1,692	1,109	583	526	94,096	YES	65.54%	34.46%	31.09%
BROOMFIELD	12,970	6,680	6,290	390	94,486	YES	51.50%	48.50%	3.01%
BACA	1,870	1,107	763	344	94,830	YES	59.20%	40.80%	18.40%
CONEJOS	1,939	1,083	856	227	95,057	YES	55.85%	44.15%	11.71%
PROWERS	3,355	1,785	1,570	215	95,272	YES	53.20%	46.80%	6.41%
ARCHULETA	3,354	1,784	1,570	214	95,486	YES	53.19%	46.81%	6.38%
PHILLIPS	1,836	1,023	813	210	95,696	YES	55.72%	44.28%	11.44%
SAGUACHE	1,473	830	643	187	95,883	YES	56.35%	43.65%	12.70%
SEDGWICK	1,070	621	449	172	96,055	YES	58.04%	41.96%	16.07%
MONTEZUMA	6,170	3,167	3,003	164	96,219	YES	51.33%	48.67%	2.66%
COSTILLA	1,197	678	519	159	96,378	YES	56.64%	43.36%	13.28%
RIO BLANCO	1,751	952	799	153	96,531	YES	54.37%	45.63%	8.74%
SAN JUAN	242	166	76	90	96,621	YES	68.60%	31.40%	37.19%
KIOWA	487	287	200	87	96,708	YES	58.93%	41.07%	17.86%
HUERFANO	2,238	1,151	1,087	64	96,772	YES	51.43%	48.57%	2.86%
MINERAL	411	234	177	57	96,829	YES	56.93%	43.07%	13.87%
OURAY	1,726	886	840	46	96,875	YES	51.33%	48.67%	2.67%
OTERO	5,024	2,533	2,491	42	96,917	YES	50.42%	49.58%	0.84%
BENT	1,330	685	645	40	96,957	YES	51.50%	48.50%	3.01%
WASHINGTON	1,542	773	769	4	96,961	YES	50.13%	49.87%	0.26%
<b>34 YES Counties</b>	<b>515,706</b>	<b>277,088</b>	<b>238,618</b>	<b>38,470</b>		<b>34</b>	<b>53.73%</b>	<b>46.27%</b>	<b>7.46%</b>

<b>State Totals</b>									
<b>County</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>	<b>TOT-NET</b>	<b>WINNER</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>1,151,893</b>	<b>599,784</b>	<b>552,109</b>	<b>47,675</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>52.07%</b>	<b>47.93%</b>	<b>4.14%</b>

<b>Summary for Chart</b>									
<b>County</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>	<b>TOT-NET</b>	<b>WINNER</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NET</b>
<b>28 NO Counties</b>	<b>434,078</b>	<b>192,396</b>	<b>241,682</b>	<b>-49,286</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>44.32%</b>	<b>55.68%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>YES Denver-Boulder</b>	<b>202,109</b>	<b>130,300</b>	<b>71,809</b>	<b>58,491</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>64.47%</b>	<b>35.53%</b>	<b>28.94%</b>
<b>34 YES Counties</b>	<b>515,706</b>	<b>277,088</b>	<b>238,618</b>	<b>38,470</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>53.73%</b>	<b>46.27%</b>	<b>7.46%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,151,893</b>	<b>599,784</b>	<b>552,109</b>	<b>47,675</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>64</b>			

