

Options for Replacing Connecticut's Voting Machines: A Cost Analysis

Michael J. Fischer, TrueVoteCT

March 12, 2005

Executive Summary

Three options are explored for bringing Connecticut's voting systems into compliance with two Title III requirements of the 2002 Help America Vote Act (HAVA) [1]:

1. At least one voting machine in each precinct must be accessible to individuals with disabilities and allow them to vote privately and independently.
2. Each voting system used in Federal elections must produce a permanent paper record with a manual audit capacity for such system.

Both of these requirements take effect January 1, 2006. The three options considered are: (1) An all-DRE system that replaces all lever machines with accessible DRE machines. (2) A mixed system that puts one accessible DRE machine in each voting district and replaces the lever machines with precinct count optical scan systems. (3) An all-optical scan system that replaces the lever machines with precinct count optical scan systems and provides accessibility through the use of ballot marking devices. For each system, the amount of equipment required to meet the needs of the 169 towns and the purchase costs are estimated. Finally, the amount of the costs that the state and/or towns must bear after taking into account the existing state HAVA funds is calculated.

Table 1: Cost summary for three voting machine options (amounts in thousands).

	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Option 1: All DRE	42,427	24,113	24,113	0	18,314
Option 2: Mixed	24,007	24,113	11,969	12,145	12,039
Option 3: All OpScan	24,098	24,113	24,098	15	0

The results are summarized in Table 1. Option 1 is much more expensive than either of the other two. HAVA funds are sufficient to cover the entire costs of Option 2 or Option 3. However, they are only assumed to be used for the DRE portion of Option 2 since there is some question whether HAVA funds can be used for the optical scan portion. Option 3 assumes the RFP is rewritten to ensure that all costs are eligible for reimbursement.

1 Introduction

The 2002 Help America Vote Act (HAVA) [1] places various requirements on the states for the conduct of federal elections. Two requirements of Title III are of particular interest here:

1. At least one voting machine in each precinct must be accessible to individuals with disabilities and allow them to vote privately and independently.
2. Each voting system used in Federal elections must produce a permanent paper record with a manual audit capacity for such system.

Both of these requirements take effect January 1, 2006. Because Connecticut’s lever machines, in use for over half a century, provide neither of these capabilities, they must all be upgraded or replaced before the end of this year.

Connecticut is currently undertaking a piecemeal approach to meeting these requirements. To meet requirement 1, the state has issued an RFP [6] for one fully accessible DRE machine per precinct. These machines will be paid for from HAVA funds that the state has already received. To meet requirement 2, the towns will be required to submit a compliance plan to the Secretary of the State.¹ The towns will then have three choices:

1. Replace their lever machines with copies of the DRE machine selected under the RFP.
2. Replace their lever machines with any other HAVA-compliant voting system that has been certified by the Secretary of the State.
3. Retrofit their lever machines (if possible) with “print-o-matic” devices for making paper impressions of the counter wheels.

In this report, we explore two of the possible outcomes of this process in some detail: Option (1) replace lever machines with DRE machines, and Option (2) replace lever machines with a mix of DRE machines to provide accessibility for the disabled and precinct count optical scan systems for the bulk of the voters. We also examine a third alternative that would require that the current RFP be reissued: Option (3) replace lever machines with precinct count optical scan systems, augmented with ballot-marking devices to provide accessibility for the disabled.

We do not explore the option of retrofitting existing lever machines with print-o-matic devices. First of all, it is unclear how many of Connecticut’s lever machines could be retrofitted, and it is also not clear if a retrofitted lever machine complies with HAVA’s requirement for a paper audit trail since it would still only be able to print out totals and not the set of ballots cast. In any case, lever machines are no longer being manufactured and Connecticut’s existing lever machines are beginning to show their age and will have to be replaced sooner or later.

¹See 2003 State HAVA Plan [2].

2 Voting Machine Overview

We first give a brief description of the three types of voting systems considered here.

2.1 Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) equipment

A DRE machine is a computer with a screen for displaying ballots and a keyboard or touchscreen through which the voter marks the ballot. We consider only *full-face ballot* DRE machines in which the ballot can be displayed on a single, large screen.

A DRE machine can be made accessible to voters with various disabilities through the addition of alternative mechanisms for displaying and marking the ballot. These include audio response units for use by the blind and puff tubes for those with impaired motor skills.

2.2 Precinct Count Optical Scan (PCOS) Systems

In a precinct count optical scan system with undervote protection, the voter marks a paper ballot with pen or pencil. The voter then inserts the marked ballot into an *optical scanner*, which reads the ballot and warns the voter of overvotes and undervotes for any office. If any problems are detected, the voter has the option of requesting a new ballot and starting over. Otherwise, the ballot is accepted, tabulated by the scanner, and placed in a locked ballot box. In case of a recount, the ballots can be rescanned by the same or different scanner, or they can be counted by hand.

In order to assure privacy, the polling place is equipped with a number of *privacy booths*. These are portable folding booths with a small desk area to allow the voter to mark the ballot without being observed.

2.3 Accessible Precinct Count Optical Scan (APCOS) Systems

A PCOS system can be made accessible to disabled voters with the addition of a computerized *ballot marking device*, which allows voters with disabilities to mark the paper optical scan ballots without assistance. It looks and operates like a disabled-accessible DRE machine except that it prints out a paper optical scan ballot rather than recoding the ballot electronically inside the machine. The ballot so printed is then scanned and tabulated in the same manner as hand-marked ballots. In either case, the ballot is checked for readability and other problems and the voter is given the opportunity to request a new ballot.

3 The Big Picture

Here we describe three possible options for Connecticut to meet the HAVA requirements that become effective on January 1, 2006.

Option 1: All DRE

The RFP process runs to completion and the state buys one accessible DRE machine per voting district using HAVA funds. We assume the towns decide that the administrative costs of dealing with multiple types of voting systems are prohibitive and therefore choose to replace their lever machines with additional DRE machines of the type selected by the RFP. The state pays for these machines from the available HAVA funds as far as those funds go. We assume the remaining costs are picked up by the towns or the state.

Advantages: Election administration will be similar to what towns are now used to with lever machines. All machines in use will be of the same kind, simplifying administration at both the state and town levels. Poll workers and voters will need to be trained in only one kind of machine.

Disadvantages: Acquisition, maintenance, and storage costs are likely to be high. Temptation will be strong to acquire only enough machines to handle a ballot of “normal” complexity in an election with “normal” turnout. A complex ballot (which slows the voting process) or a higher-than-expected voter turnout could both lead to long voter lines like other states experienced in the November 2004 election. Increasing election capacity requires additional capital and considerable lead time in order to acquire new equipment.

Option 2: Mixed DRE/OpScan

The RFP process runs to completion and the state buys one accessible DRE machine per voting district using HAVA funds. We assume the towns decide to replace their lever machines with a non-accessible precinct count optical scan system (PCOS) and to meet the HAVA accessibility requirements with the RFP-selected DRE machine. We assume they will purchase a second DRE machine per voting district, using HAVA funds, in order to have a spare in case the primary machine breaks down. To not have a spare runs the very real risk of denying disabled voters their HAVA-guaranteed right to vote privately and independently on election day. For similar reasons, we assume they will also purchase a spare optical scanner for each voting district.

Advantages: Optical scan systems require considerably less equipment than DRE systems. This results in lower costs throughout the life-cycle of the voting equipment, from initial purchase to annual maintenance, storage, and administration costs. Complex ballots that take voters longer to mark will require additional privacy booths but not more electronic equipment. Peak voter turnouts will not generally require additional scanners since the spare scanner can be put into use in an emergency to handle the extra load. Optical scan ballots can be used for absentee voters and counted on the same scanners as used in the polling place.

Disadvantages: Two voting systems must be maintained and administered. They will likely be from different vendors because the RFP for the DRE machines does not take into consideration the vendor's ability to furnish compatible optical scan equipment for replacing the lever machines. Poll workers and voters will need to be trained in the use of both kinds of systems.

Option 3: Accessible OpScan

We assume the RFP is reissued to request proposals from vendors for systems that meet both of Connecticut's voting system needs: accessible machines for the disabled and lever machine replacements. The reissued RFP relaxes the dates by which systems must be certified in order to allow the state to consider emerging technologies such as ballot marking devices that allow precinct optical scan systems to meet accessibility requirements. Favorable consideration is given to vendors that can provide integrated solutions that simplify election administration. All such systems acquired under this RFP would be for the purpose of complying with HAVA's Title III provisions, making them eligible for reimbursement from the current state HAVA funding.

For the purposes of this analysis, we will assume that the outcome of the RFP process would be an accessible precinct count optical scan system as described in Section 2.3.

Advantages: Cheaper than option 1 for all but the smallest voting districts. Simpler administration than option 2 since the components are integrated and maintained by the same vendor. No need for separate voter-verified paper records because the ballot itself is paper. Also shares all of the optical scan advantages cited above for option 2.

Disadvantages: According to our model, a voting district whose size is slightly larger than the capacity of a single optical scanner would have to buy two in Option (3), but if a DRE is used to provide disabled access (as in Option (2)), the load on the scanner is reduced slightly, and hence the town might get by with only one. The difference is slight, but it helps to explain the slightly lower total cost for option (2) than for option (3).

4 Cost Analysis

We now describe a cost analysis for each of the three options, the results of which appear in Appendix A. We perform the analysis by estimating for each option and each town in Connecticut the amount of equipment it would require. We next estimate the cost of each kind of machine – DRE, ballot marking device, optical scanner, and privacy booth. Finally, we total up the cost of the equipment for the town.

We then look at the implications of HAVA funding. Under options 1 and 2, we assume that the current RFP runs to completion and that HAVA funding is only used to purchase DRE machines

selected by the RFP. Under option 3, we assume that HAVA funding is applied against all voting equipment purchased.

We proceed to describe the assumptions and the cost model in greater detail.

4.1 Modeling Equipment Needs

Each piece of voting equipment has a certain capacity, that is, a rate at which it can process voters. A DRE machine or ballot marking device is occupied by a voter during the time it takes the voter to approach the machine, make his or her selections, verify the paper record, cast the ballot, and leave the machine. A precinct count scanner is occupied for the amount of time it takes a voter to insert the marked ballot into the scanner and have the scanner accept it. A voter privacy booth is occupied for the time it takes the voter to mark the ballot.

In a typical election, the polls are open from 6:00 am until 8:00 pm. This is 14 hours or 840 minutes. If a voter takes 3 minutes to vote on a DRE machine, for example, then the maximum capacity of the machine would be $840/3 = 280$ voters. In the November 2004 election, most Connecticut towns experienced average voting times on lever machines of only 1 to 2 minutes, giving estimates of the capacity of lever machines that range from 420 to 840 voters. Reports from other states for DRE machines are much lower, in the range of 200–250 voters per machine. Part of these differences could be explained by differences in the complexity of the ballot – long complex ballots take voter longer to fill out than short simple ones. Another part could be the effect of a full-face ballot. It likely takes a voter longer to page through a ballot screen by screen than to vote on a single large screen. For these reasons, we have taken an optimistically large estimate of 350 for the capacity of DRE machines, ballot marking devices, and privacy booths. For optical scanners, we have assumed they can process 3000 ballots on election day. While this allows only 17 seconds per ballot, East Lyme actually handled 9,525 ballots with its three precinct-count optical scanners in the November 2004 election.

We based our model for each town on only two pieces of data: The number of voters who voted at town polling places in November 2004 [5] and the number of voting districts in the town [4]. Dividing these two numbers gives the average number of voters per voting district. It would seem at first sight that one could compute the average size voting district in the town and then base the amount of equipment needed on that number. However, that number could considerably exaggerate the amount of equipment needed.

Consider for example how many DRE machines might be required for a town with 1500 voters and 2 voting districts. We would first calculate that the average voting district size is 750. Using one DRE machine per 350 voters, we would conclude that the town needed 3 machines per voting district, plus 1 spare, for a total of 8 machines. However, if actual sizes of those two voting districts were, say 650 and 850, then we would see that 2 machines plus 1 spare would be enough for the smaller district and 3 machines plus 1 spare enough for the larger district for a total of 7 machines.

Since we don't have the data on a district-by-district basis, and because these numbers vary from election to election anyway, we base our numbers instead on the aggregate number of voters

in the town. That is, we divide the number of voters by the machine capacity to get the number of active machines that the town requires. We then add in one machine per district to serve as a spare.

The problem of estimating the number of scanners is slightly different. Because scanner capacity is so large, using the above averaging method for computing the needed number of scanners for a town could result in a number smaller than the number of voting districts. This obviously would not work, since each district needs at least one scanner in an optical scan solution no matter how small the district. Therefore, for option 3, we calculate the number scanners needed by a town to be the larger of the number of voting districts and the number of scanners that would be needed based on capacity.

Option 2 presents yet another subtlety. Assuming each voting district already has a DRE machine in active use, then optical scan equipment only needs to handle voters beyond the DRE machine's capacity. We have therefore subtracted off the capacity of the DRE machines from the total number of voters in calculating how many scanners are needed. Again, we assume a minimum of one scanner per voting district unless the town's DRE machines have sufficient capacity to handle the entire election.²

Finally, a word about spares. Our calculations assume that whenever a voting district has one or more active DRE machine, ballot-marking device, or optical scanner that it also has one spare such machine. We believe having one spare "at the ready" is essential for reliability on election day.

4.2 Equipment Costs Estimates

Equipment costs for non-commodity equipment such as voting systems are difficult to estimate since they are negotiated and depend on many variables. We have therefore chosen an indirect method of estimating their costs. We understand that the Secretary of the State has said that she expects the current RFP for 771 DRE machines to cost about \$6 M. Using this figure, we get a cost of \$7,782 per machine. We use the same figure for a ballot marking device since the technologies are basically similar. For a scanner, we have heard price estimates that vary between \$5,000 and \$7,000. We have chosen to be conservative and go with the higher \$7,000 figure since we believe that the SOTS figure of \$6 M is likely also to be on the conservative side. The fact that it is somewhat less than the cost of a DRE machine or ballot marking device is also consistent with the fact that a scanner does not require a large screen or sophisticated user interface. For privacy booths that voters use when marking optical scan ballots, we have used a figure of \$250 per booth.

4.3 HAVA Fund Analysis

In order to calculate the cost to the state or towns for any of these proposals, we need to know how much HAVA money is available for voting machine equipment and how it might be used.

²This does not occur in any towns under the assumptions we have been using.

We base availability on the budget in the 2003 State HAVA Plan [2], adjusted to reflect the \$32.7 M actual HAVA funding received [3, Tables 1 and 2]. The State HAVA Plan estimated that Connecticut would receive \$27.8 M of HAVA funding, of which \$20.5 M would be used for voting systems. We have adjusted this latter amount upwards in proportion to the increased total amount of HAVA funding to come up with the figure of \$24,113,309 for voting systems used in the analysis.

For option 1, the HAVA funding is sufficient to purchase 3099 DRE machines. Our calculations show that 5452 will be needed. The difference, which must be funded from other sources, comes to \$18.3 M.

For option 2, the HAVA funding is more than sufficient to purchase both the 771 machines included in the current RFP and also another 769 machines needed for spares. We have assumed in our calculations that towns will *not* be reimbursed for lever replacement machines that differ from the machine selected by the RFP. That means that if all towns choose to supplement their accessible DRE machines with optical scan systems that a considerable amount of HAVA funds will go unused. We calculate that residual amount for option 2 to be \$12.1 M. This amount would be just sufficient to cover the costs of the optical scan equipment if HAVA funds were used for that purpose.

For option 3, we assume that a new RFP would be issued and that the available HAVA funds would be used to put integrated accessible voting systems in all voting districts, replacing the current lever machines. By our calculations, the available HAVA funds would be just sufficient to provide accessible optical scan systems to all towns in Connecticut.

5 Conclusion

While further refinement of the model and the assumptions on which it is based will certainly affect the bottom line cost figures we project, they are unlikely to significantly alter these basic conclusions:

- Optical scan is a much less expensive voting technology than DRE machines.
- Optical scan systems augmented with ballot marking devices are fully HAVA-compliant.
- Existing HAVA funding is more or less adequate to provide all towns in Connecticut with fully HAVA-compliant voting systems if it can be used for that purpose.
- The current approach of placing one accessible DRE machine in each polling place without giving due consideration to how the towns are going to comply with HAVA's paper audit trail requirement will likely result in a hodge-podge of costly voting equipment that is difficult to administer and expensive to maintain.

References

- [1] 107th Congress. *Help America Vote Act of 2002, Public Law 107-252*. Federal Government, October 2002. http://www.fec.gov/hava/law_ext.txtc.
- [2] Susan Bysiewicz. *State of Connecticut State Plan, As required by the Help America Vote Act, Public Law 107-252, Section 253(b)*. Secretary of the State, July 2003. <http://www.sots.state.ct.us/ElectionsDivision/HAVA/StatePlan.pdf>.
- [3] Hon. Gracia M. Hillman. *Fiscal Year 2004 Annual Report*. U.S. Election Assistance Commission, January 2005. <http://www.eac.gov/docs/EAC%20Annual%20Report%20FY04.pdf>.
- [4] Secretary of the State. *2004 Voting Machine Statistics*, February 2004. Summary of reports from the Town Clerks. See <http://www.das.state.ct.us/rfpdoc/VMS04.XLS>.
- [5] Secretary of the State. *November 02, 2004 General Election Statistics*, November 2004. http://209.101.151.73/statementofvote/Reports%5CStatistics_by3.html.
- [6] State of Connecticut, Department of Administrative Services. *RFP 04PSX0401*, December 2004. http://www.das.state.ct.us/rfpdoc/004_0401.pdf.

A Cost Analysis Spreadsheets

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Summary

(amounts in thousands)

Option	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Option 1: Pure DRE machines	42,427	24,113	24,113	0	18,314
Option 2: Mixed DRE/OpScan (1)	24,007	24,113	11,969	12,145	12,039
Option 3: Pure OpScan (2)	24,098	24,113	24,098	15	0

(1) This assumes that HAVA funds can only be used on the type of equipment specified in the RFP, and that HAVA funds will not be used for optical scan systems if they are purchased to supplement the DRE's specified in the RFP.

(2) This assumes a new RFP that allows HAVA funds to be used for all equipment purchased to meet HAVA Title III requirements.

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Assumptions

Quantity	Value	Comment
DRE_cap	350	Number of voters per DRE
DRE_spares_district	1	Number of spare DRE's per district
DRE_cost	7,782	Cost per DRE (from SOTS remarks, \$6M/771)
ballot_mark_cap	350	Number of voters per ballot marking device (same as DRE)
ballot_mark_spares_per_district	1	Number of spare ballot marking devices per district
ballot_mark_cost	7,782	Cost per ballot marking device (assumed same as DRE)
scanner_cap	3,000	Number of voters per scanner
scanners_spares_per_district	1	Number of spare scanners per district
scanner_cost	7,000	Cost per scanner (assumed same as DRE)
privacy_booths_capacity	350	Number of voters per privacy booth
privacy_booth cost	250	Cost of a privacy booth
HAVA_voting_sys_plan	20,500,000	Budget for voting systems, from 2003 State HAVA Plan
HAVA_total_plan	27,800,000	Total HAVA funds expected, from 2003 State HAVA Plan
HAVA_voting_sys_available	24,113,309	Pro-rata share of actual HAVA funds for voting systems
HAVA_total_received	32,700,000	Actual HAVA funds received

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Voting Machine Options – Illustration

District Size	Option 1: Pure DRE machines				Option 2: Mixed DRE/OpScan							
	Number of active DRE	Number of spare DRE	Total number of DRE	Total Cost (thousands)	Number of active DRE	Number of spare DRE	Number of active scanners	Number of spare scanners	Total number privacy booths	Total number of DRE	Total number of scanners	Total Cost (thousands)
250	1	1	2	16	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	16
500	2	1	3	23	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	30
750	3	1	4	31	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	30
1,000	3	1	4	31	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	30
1,250	4	1	5	39	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	30
1,500	5	1	6	47	1	1	1	1	4	2	2	31
1,750	5	1	6	47	1	1	1	1	4	2	2	31
2,000	6	1	7	54	1	1	1	1	5	2	2	31
2,250	7	1	8	62	1	1	1	1	6	2	2	31
2,500	8	1	9	70	1	1	1	1	7	2	2	31
2,750	8	1	9	70	1	1	1	1	7	2	2	31
3,000	9	1	10	78	1	1	1	1	8	2	2	32
3,250	10	1	11	86	1	1	1	1	9	2	2	32
3,500	10	1	11	86	1	1	2	1	9	2	3	39
3,750	11	1	12	93	1	1	2	1	10	2	3	39
4,000	12	1	13	101	1	1	2	1	11	2	3	39
4,250	13	1	14	109	1	1	2	1	12	2	3	40
4,500	13	1	14	109	1	1	2	1	12	2	3	40
4,750	14	1	15	117	1	1	2	1	13	2	3	40
5,000	15	1	16	125	1	1	2	1	14	2	3	40
5,250	15	1	16	125	1	1	2	1	14	2	3	40
5,500	16	1	17	132	1	1	2	1	15	2	3	40
5,750	17	1	18	140	1	1	2	1	16	2	3	41
6,000	18	1	19	148	1	1	2	1	17	2	3	41
6,250	18	1	19	148	1	1	2	1	17	2	3	41
6,500	19	1	20	156	1	1	3	1	18	2	4	48
6,750	20	1	21	163	1	1	3	1	19	2	4	48
7,000	20	1	21	163	1	1	3	1	19	2	4	48

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Voting Machine Options – Illustration

District Size	Option 3: Pure OpScan							
	Number of active ballot marking devices	Number of spare ballot marking devices	Number of active scanners	Number of spare scanners	Total number privacy booths	Total number of ballot marking devices	Total number of scanners	Total Cost (thousands)
250	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	30
500	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	30
750	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	30
1,000	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	30
1,250	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	30
1,500	1	1	1	1	4	2	2	31
1,750	1	1	1	1	4	2	2	31
2,000	1	1	1	1	5	2	2	31
2,250	1	1	1	1	6	2	2	31
2,500	1	1	1	1	7	2	2	31
2,750	1	1	1	1	7	2	2	31
3,000	1	1	1	1	8	2	2	32
3,250	1	1	2	1	9	2	3	39
3,500	1	1	2	1	9	2	3	39
3,750	1	1	2	1	10	2	3	39
4,000	1	1	2	1	11	2	3	39
4,250	1	1	2	1	12	2	3	40
4,500	1	1	2	1	12	2	3	40
4,750	1	1	2	1	13	2	3	40
5,000	1	1	2	1	14	2	3	40
5,250	1	1	2	1	14	2	3	40
5,500	1	1	2	1	15	2	3	40
5,750	1	1	2	1	16	2	3	41
6,000	1	1	2	1	17	2	3	41
6,250	1	1	3	1	17	2	4	48
6,500	1	1	3	1	18	2	4	48
6,750	1	1	3	1	19	2	4	48
7,000	1	1	3	1	19	2	4	48

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Voting Statistics by Town

Town	Current Machine Type	From 2004 Voting Machine Statistics			From Nov. 2004 General Election Statistics		Calculated Statistics					
		Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares	Reg. voters	Voted in Nov. 2005	Voter Turnout (%)	Reg. Voters / District	Reg. Voters / Machine	Use (excluding voter spares)	time / (min:sec)	Number Voted / District
Andover	lever	1	4	1	2,146	1,801	84%	2,146	537	600	1:24	1,801
Ansonia	lever	7	21	7	19,358	15,286	79%	2,765	922	1,092	0:46	2,184
Ashford	lever	1	4	1	2,789	2,309	83%	2,789	697	770	1:05	2,309
Avon	lever	2	22	9	11,683	10,262	88%	5,842	531	789	1:04	5,131
Barkhamsted	lever	2	5	2	2,575	2,177	85%	1,288	515	726	1:09	1,089
Beacon Falls	lever	1	8	4	3,517	2,941	84%	3,517	440	735	1:09	2,941
Berlin	lever	5	22	5	12,805	10,754	84%	2,561	582	633	1:20	2,151
Bethany	lever	1	5	1	3,771	3,323	88%	3,771	754	831	1:01	3,323
Bethel	lever	5	18	4	11,278	9,622	85%	2,256	627	687	1:13	1,924
Bethlehem	lever	1	5	1	2,806	2,311	82%	2,806	561	578	1:27	2,311
Bloomfield	lever	6	20	6	13,991	10,758	77%	2,332	700	768	1:06	1,793
Bolton	lever	1	6	1	3,515	3,078	88%	3,515	586	616	1:22	3,078
Bozrah	lever	1	3	1	1,693	1,421	84%	1,693	564	711	1:11	1,421
Branford	lever	7	28	4	19,167	14,950	78%	2,738	685	623	1:21	2,136
Bridgeport	lever	25	122	69	59,102	37,717	64%	2,364	484	712	1:11	1,509
Bridgewater	lever	1	4	2	1,439	1,185	82%	1,439	360	593	1:25	1,185
Bristol	lever	10	40	4	32,880	25,349	77%	3,288	822	704	1:12	2,535
Brookfield	lever	2	16	4	10,592	8,892	84%	5,296	662	741	1:08	4,446
Brooklyn	lever	1	6	1	4,593	3,407	74%	4,593	766	681	1:14	3,407
Burlington	lever	1	7	1	6,098	5,146	84%	6,098	871	858	0:59	5,146
Canaan	lever	1	2	1	768	623	81%	768	384	623	1:21	623
Canterbury	lever	1	5	1	3,330	2,651	80%	3,330	666	663	1:16	2,651
Canton	lever	1	7	1	6,488	5,643	87%	6,488	927	941	0:54	5,643
Chaplin	lever	1	3	1	1,413	1,103	78%	1,413	471	552	1:31	1,103
Cheshire	lever	7	29	6	17,825	15,064	85%	2,546	615	655	1:17	2,152
Chester	lever	1	4	1	2,603	2,227	86%	2,603	651	742	1:08	2,227
Clinton	lever	1	12	2	8,891	6,928	78%	8,891	741	693	1:13	6,928
Colchester	lever	1	11	0	9,296	7,821	84%	9,296	845	711	1:11	7,821
Colebrook	lever	1	2	0	1,136	929	82%	1,136	568	465	1:49	929

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Voting Statistics by Town

Town	Current Machine Type	From 2004 Voting Machine Statistics			From Nov. 2004 General Election Statistics		Calculated Statistics					
		Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares	Reg. voters	Voted in Nov. 2005	Voter Turnout (%)	Reg. Voters / District	Reg. Voters / Machine	Use (excluding voter spares)	time / (min:sec)	Number Voted / District
Columbia	lever	1	5	1	3,584	3,142	88%	3,584	717	786	1:04	3,142
Cornwall	lever	1	3	1	1,062	952	90%	1,062	354	476	1:46	952
Coventry	lever	2	10	2	7,772	6,407	82%	3,886	777	801	1:03	3,204
Cromwell	lever	1	12	2	9,025	7,510	83%	9,025	752	751	1:07	7,510
Danbury	lever	16	44	3	32,697	26,248	80%	2,044	743	640	1:19	1,641
Darien	lever	6	22	4	12,307	11,134	90%	2,051	559	619	1:21	1,856
Deep River	lever	1	4	0	3,209	2,619	82%	3,209	802	655	1:17	2,619
Derby	lever	2	14	7	6,773	5,329	79%	3,387	484	761	1:06	2,665
Durham	lever	2	7	1	9,688	7,752	80%	4,844	1,384	1,292	0:39	3,876
East Granby	lever	2	5	1	3,333	2,794	84%	1,667	667	699	1:12	1,397
East Haddam	lever	1	6	1	5,834	4,730	81%	5,834	972	946	0:53	4,730
East Hampton	lever	1	11	2	8,240	6,619	80%	8,240	749	735	1:09	6,619
East Hartford	lever	7	51	20	26,499	18,820	71%	3,786	520	607	1:23	2,689
East Haven	lever	7	28	6	16,052	12,066	75%	2,293	573	548	1:32	1,724
East Lyme	optical	3	3	0	11,534	9,525	83%	3,845	3,845	3,175	0:16	3,175
East Windsor	lever	2	12	4	6,504	4,754	73%	3,252	542	594	1:25	2,377
Eastford	lever	1	3	1	1,114	949	85%	1,114	371	475	1:46	949
Easton	lever	1	7	0	5,265	4,536	86%	5,265	752	648	1:18	4,536
Ellington	lever	2	12	2	8,805	7,452	85%	4,403	734	745	1:08	3,726
Enfield	lever	9	39	8	27,108	19,994	74%	3,012	695	645	1:18	2,222
Essex	lever	2	8	1	4,697	4,139	88%	2,349	587	591	1:25	2,070
Fairfield	lever	13	51	10	35,617	30,808	86%	2,740	698	751	1:07	2,370
Farmington	lever	4	21	3	16,138	13,773	85%	4,035	768	765	1:06	3,443
Franklin	lever	1	4	2	1,272	1,072	84%	1,272	318	536	1:34	1,072
Glastonbury	lever	9	33	6	22,135	19,211	87%	2,459	671	712	1:11	2,135
Goshen	lever	2	3	1	2,008	1,705	85%	1,004	669	853	0:59	853
Granby	lever	2	11	2	7,364	6,281	85%	3,682	669	698	1:12	3,141
Greenwich	lever	12	53	12	34,933	30,888	88%	2,911	659	753	1:07	2,574
Griswold	lever	2	13	2	6,395	4,581	72%	3,198	492	416	2:01	2,291

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Voting Statistics by Town

Town	Current Machine Type	From 2004 Voting Machine Statistics			From Nov. 2004 General Election Statistics		Calculated Statistics					
		Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares	Reg. voters	Voted in Nov. 2005	Voter Turnout (%)	Reg. Voters / District	Reg. Voters / Machine	Use (excluding voter spares)	time / (min:sec)	Number Voted / District
Groton	lever	8	29	6	19,684	14,856	75%	2,461	679	646	1:18	1,857
Guilford	lever	4	22	4	15,717	12,990	83%	3,929	714	722	1:10	3,248
Haddam	lever	2	11	3	5,524	4,532	82%	2,762	502	567	1:29	2,266
Hamden	lever	11	57	17	34,315	28,361	83%	3,120	602	709	1:11	2,578
Hampton	lever	1	3	1	1,222	1,085	89%	1,222	407	543	1:33	1,085
Hartford	lever	23	75	23	49,803	28,987	58%	2,165	664	557	1:30	1,260
Hartland	lever	1	3	1	1,485	1,179	79%	1,485	495	590	1:25	1,179
Harwinton	lever	2	7	2	3,791	3,173	84%	1,896	542	635	1:19	1,587
Hebron	lever	1	9	2	6,086	5,152	85%	6,086	676	736	1:08	5,152
Kent	lever	1	4	1	2,091	1,794	86%	2,091	523	598	1:24	1,794
Killingly	lever	5	28	16	8,976	6,534	73%	1,795	321	545	1:33	1,307
Killingworth	lever	1	7	2	4,596	3,845	84%	4,596	657	769	1:06	3,845
Lebanon	lever	1	9	2	4,683	3,858	82%	4,683	520	551	1:31	3,858
Ledyard	lever	2	13	2	8,816	7,217	82%	4,408	678	656	1:17	3,609
Lisbon	lever	1	5	1	2,529	2,054	81%	2,529	506	514	1:38	2,054
Litchfield	lever	4	11	2	6,216	4,345	70%	1,554	565	483	1:44	1,086
Lyme	lever	1	4	1	1,773	1,503	85%	1,773	443	501	1:41	1,503
Madison	lever	2	19	2	13,266	10,948	83%	6,633	698	644	1:18	5,474
Manchester	lever	10	53	16	32,142	23,643	74%	3,214	606	639	1:19	2,364
Mansfield	lever	3	14	5	10,359	8,627	83%	3,453	740	959	0:53	2,876
Marlborough	lever	1	6	1	4,174	3,658	88%	4,174	696	732	1:09	3,658
Meriden	lever	20	20	3	31,278	22,893	73%	1,564	1,564	1,347	0:37	1,145
Middlebury	lever	1	8	2	4,694	4,112	88%	4,694	587	685	1:14	4,112
Middlefield	lever	1	7	3	3,119	2,649	85%	3,119	446	662	1:16	2,649
Middletown	lever	15	44	0	24,867	19,634	79%	1,658	565	446	1:53	1,309
Milford	lever	10	42	4	32,377	27,111	84%	3,238	771	713	1:11	2,711
Monroe	lever	4	18	3	12,766	10,715	84%	3,192	709	714	1:11	2,679
Montville	lever	6	20	6	9,571	7,987	83%	1,595	479	571	1:28	1,331
Morris	lever	1	0	0	1,664	1,403	84%	1,664				1,403

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Voting Statistics by Town

Town	Current Machine Type	From 2004 Voting Machine Statistics			From Nov. 2004 General Election Statistics		Calculated Statistics					
		Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares	Reg. voters	Voted in Nov. 2005	Voter Turnout (%)	Reg. Voters / District	Reg. Voters / Machine	Use (excluding voter spares)	time / (min:sec)	Number Voted / District
Naugatuck	lever	10	26	4	17,468	12,957	74%	1,747	672	589	1:26	1,296
New Britain	lever	15	87	20	30,925	21,384	69%	2,062	355	319	2:38	1,426
New Canaan	lever	3	19	5	12,759	11,085	87%	4,253	672	792	1:04	3,695
New Fairfield	lever	2	13	3	9,178	7,497	82%	4,589	706	750	1:07	3,749
New Hartford	lever	2	8	2	4,585	3,919	85%	2,293	573	653	1:17	1,960
New Haven	lever	52	108	25	58,094	39,458	68%	1,117	538	475	1:46	759
New London	lever	7	25	7	11,124	7,573	68%	1,589	445	421	2:00	1,082
New Milford	lever	7	22	2	17,505	13,314	76%	2,501	796	666	1:16	1,902
Newington	lever	8	37	4	19,279	16,261	84%	2,410	521	493	1:42	2,033
Newtown	lever	4	22	4	16,598	14,534	88%	4,150	754	807	1:02	3,634
Norfolk	lever	1	3	1	1,116	985	88%	1,116	372	493	1:42	985
North Branford	lever	2	14	4	8,743	7,377	84%	4,372	625	738	1:08	3,689
North Canaan	lever	1	4	1	1,971	1,543	78%	1,971	493	514	1:38	1,543
North Haven	lever	5	10	5	16,095	13,174	82%	3,219	1,610	2,635	0:19	2,635
North Stonington	lever	1	5	1	3,512	2,826	80%	3,512	702	707	1:11	2,826
Norwalk	lever	14	65	14	47,651	35,801	75%	3,404	733	702	1:12	2,557
Norwich	lever	10	27	5	19,880	14,036	71%	1,988	736	638	1:19	1,404
Old Lyme	optical	1	2	1	5,984	4,809	80%	5,984	2,992	4,809	0:10	4,809
Old Saybrook	lever	2	11	2	7,395	6,082	82%	3,698	672	676	1:15	3,041
Orange	lever	2	13	2	9,737	8,298	85%	4,869	749	754	1:07	4,149
Oxford	lever	1	10	2	7,341	6,046	82%	7,341	734	756	1:07	6,046
Plainfield	lever	4	14	3	8,858	6,117	69%	2,215	633	556	1:31	1,529
Plainville	lever	4	16	4	10,557	8,201	78%	2,639	660	683	1:14	2,050
Plymouth	lever	2	15	7	7,563	5,666	75%	3,782	504	708	1:11	2,833
Pomfret	lever	1	4	1	2,779	2,242	81%	2,779	695	747	1:07	2,242
Portland	lever	1	10	2	6,357	5,152	81%	6,357	636	644	1:18	5,152
Preston	lever	1	4	0	3,355	2,554	76%	3,355	839	639	1:19	2,554
Prospect	lever	2	11	4	5,803	5,079	88%	2,902	528	726	1:09	2,540
Putnam	lever	2	9	3	5,010	4,001	80%	2,505	557	667	1:16	2,001

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Voting Statistics by Town

Town	Current Machine Type	From 2004 Voting Machine Statistics			From Nov. 2004 General Election Statistics		Calculated Statistics					
		Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares	Reg. voters	Voted in Nov. 2005	Voter Turnout (%)	Reg. Voters / District	Reg. Voters / Machine	Use (excluding voter spares)	time / (min:sec)	Number Voted / District
Redding	lever	2	8	1	6,318	5,495	87%	3,159	790	785	1:04	2,748
Ridgefield	lever	3	22	3	16,909	14,186	84%	5,636	769	747	1:08	4,729
Rocky Hill	lever	3	19	6	11,615	9,852	85%	3,872	611	758	1:07	3,284
Roxbury	lever	1	3	1	1,870	1,654	88%	1,870	623	827	1:01	1,654
Salem	lever	1	4	1	2,630	2,181	83%	2,630	658	727	1:09	2,181
Salisbury	lever	1	5	1	2,815	2,392	85%	2,815	563	598	1:24	2,392
Scotland	lever	1	2	1	1,064	881	83%	1,064	532	881	0:57	881
Seymour	lever	3	15	3	9,123	7,434	81%	3,041	608	620	1:21	2,478
Sharon	lever	1	3	1	1,974	1,623	82%	1,974	658	812	1:02	1,623
Shelton	lever	6	37	6	24,294	19,831	82%	4,049	657	640	1:19	3,305
Sherman	lever	2	4	1	2,577	2,125	82%	1,289	644	708	1:11	1,063
Simsbury	lever	4	23	3	17,073	14,074	82%	4,268	742	704	1:12	3,519
Somers	lever	1	9	2	5,958	4,557	76%	5,958	662	651	1:17	4,557
South Windsor	lever	7	21	2	16,177	14,123	87%	2,311	770	743	1:08	2,018
Southbury	lever	5	22	6	13,992	11,575	83%	2,798	636	723	1:10	2,315
Southington	lever	12	46	11	27,134	21,681	80%	2,261	590	619	1:21	1,807
Sprague	lever	1	5	3	1,657	1,375	83%	1,657	331	688	1:13	1,375
Stafford	lever	3	15	3	7,464	6,214	83%	2,488	498	518	1:37	2,071
Stamford	lever	23	96	23	59,357	47,496	80%	2,581	618	651	1:17	2,065
Sterling	lever	1	3	1	1,870	1,379	74%	1,870	623	690	1:13	1,379
Stonington	lever	5	18	2	12,449	9,926	80%	2,490	692	620	1:21	1,985
Stratford	lever	13	52	15	32,691	24,187	74%	2,515	629	654	1:17	1,861
Suffield	lever	1	13	1	8,558	7,013	82%	8,558	658	584	1:26	7,013
Thomaston	lever	1	7	1	4,942	3,956	80%	4,942	706	659	1:16	3,956
Thompson	lever	4	12	5	5,233	4,323	83%	1,308	436	618	1:22	1,081
Tolland	lever	2	11	1	9,430	8,166	87%	4,715	857	817	1:02	4,083
Torrington	lever	8	31	8	19,446	15,973	82%	2,431	627	694	1:13	1,997
Trumbull	lever	7	34	6	24,267	19,913	82%	3,467	714	711	1:11	2,845
Union	lever	1	3	1	548	485	89%	548	183	243	3:28	485

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Voting Statistics by Town

Town	Current Machine Type	From 2004 Voting Machine Statistics			From Nov. 2004 General Election Statistics		Calculated Statistics					
		Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares	Reg. voters	Voted in Nov. 2005	Voter Turnout (%)	Reg. Voters / District	Reg. Voters / Machine	Use (excluding voter spares)	time / (min:sec)	Number Voted / District
Vernon	lever	6	31	10	16,625	13,879	83%	2,771	536	661	1:16	2,313
Voluntown	lever	1	3	1	1,565	1,238	79%	1,565	522	619	1:21	1,238
Wallingford	lever	9	41	8	27,265	22,140	81%	3,029	665	671	1:15	2,460
Warren	lever	1	4	1	909	792	87%	909	227	264	3:11	792
Washington	lever	1	4	1	2,400	2,234	93%	2,400	600	745	1:08	2,234
Waterbury	lever	23	102	9	55,004	32,732	60%	2,391	539	352	2:23	1,423
Waterford	lever	4	20	4	12,925	10,454	81%	3,231	646	653	1:17	2,614
Watertown	lever	4	20	4	14,078	11,389	81%	3,520	704	712	1:11	2,847
West Hartford	lever	20	73	3	40,270	33,755	84%	2,014	552	482	1:45	1,688
West Haven	lever	10	48	8	30,050	21,368	71%	3,005	626	534	1:34	2,137
Westbrook	optical	2	2	0	4,222	3,782	90%	2,111	2,111	1,891	0:27	1,891
Weston	lever	2	10	2	6,278	5,667	90%	3,139	628	708	1:11	2,834
Westport	lever	6	28	8	17,652	15,444	87%	2,942	630	772	1:05	2,574
Wethersfield	lever	10	34	10	18,135	16,472	91%	1,814	533	686	1:13	1,647
Willington	lever	1	5	1	3,630	3,060	84%	3,630	726	765	1:06	3,060
Wilton	lever	3	16	2	11,766	10,447	89%	3,922	735	746	1:08	3,482
Winchester	lever	1	10	2	7,090	5,273	74%	7,090	709	659	1:16	5,273
Windham	lever	5	19	3	14,035	8,187	58%	2,807	739	512	1:38	1,637
Windsor	lever	7	32	5	18,568	14,932	80%	2,653	580	553	1:31	2,133
Windsor Locks	lever	2	12	2	14,986	12,076	81%	7,493	1,249	1,208	0:42	6,038
Wolcott	lever	3	15	3	10,234	8,437	82%	3,411	682	703	1:12	2,812
Woodbridge	lever	1	9	2	6,162	5,511	89%	6,162	685	787	1:04	5,511
Woodbury	lever	2	10	2	6,635	5,881	89%	3,318	664	735	1:09	2,941
Woodstock	lever	1	7	1	4,944	4,304	87%	4,944	706	717	1:10	4,304
TOTALS.....		769	3196	726	2,044,181	1,607,808	79%	2,658	640	651	1:17	2,091

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 1: All towns buy DREs from RFP

(amounts in thousands)

Town	# Voters	# Voting Districts	# DRE			Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
			Active	Spares	Total needed		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Andover	1,801	1	6	1	7	54	31	31	0	24
Ansonia	15,286	7	44	7	51	397	226	226	0	171
Ashford	2,309	1	7	1	8	62	35	35	0	27
Avon	10,262	2	30	2	32	249	142	142	0	107
Barkhamsted	2,177	2	7	2	9	70	40	40	0	30
Beacon Falls	2,941	1	9	1	10	78	44	44	0	34
Berlin	10,754	5	31	5	36	280	159	159	0	121
Bethany	3,323	1	10	1	11	86	49	49	0	37
Bethel	9,622	5	28	5	33	257	146	146	0	111
Bethlehem	2,311	1	7	1	8	62	35	35	0	27
Bloomfield	10,758	6	31	6	37	288	164	164	0	124
Bolton	3,078	1	9	1	10	78	44	44	0	34
Bozrah	1,421	1	5	1	6	47	27	27	0	20
Branford	14,950	7	43	7	50	389	221	221	0	168
Bridgeport	37,717	25	108	25	133	1,035	588	588	0	447
Bridgewater	1,185	1	4	1	5	39	22	22	0	17
Bristol	25,349	10	73	10	83	646	367	367	0	279
Brookfield	8,892	2	26	2	28	218	124	124	0	94
Brooklyn	3,407	1	10	1	11	86	49	49	0	37
Burlington	5,146	1	15	1	16	125	71	71	0	54
Canaan	623	1	2	1	3	23	13	13	0	10
Canterbury	2,651	1	8	1	9	70	40	40	0	30
Canton	5,643	1	17	1	18	140	80	80	0	60
Chaplin	1,103	1	4	1	5	39	22	22	0	17
Cheshire	15,064	7	44	7	51	397	226	226	0	171
Chester	2,227	1	7	1	8	62	35	35	0	27
Clinton	6,928	1	20	1	21	163	93	93	0	71
Colchester	7,821	1	23	1	24	187	106	106	0	81
Colebrook	929	1	3	1	4	31	18	18	0	13
Columbia	3,142	1	9	1	10	78	44	44	0	34
Cornwall	952	1	3	1	4	31	18	18	0	13
Coventry	6,407	2	19	2	21	163	93	93	0	71
Cromwell	7,510	1	22	1	23	179	102	102	0	77
Danbury	26,248	16	75	16	91	708	402	402	0	306
Darien	11,134	6	32	6	38	296	168	168	0	128
Deep River	2,619	1	8	1	9	70	40	40	0	30
Derby	5,329	2	16	2	18	140	80	80	0	60
Durham	7,752	2	23	2	25	195	111	111	0	84
East Granby	2,794	2	8	2	10	78	44	44	0	34

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 1: All towns buy DREs from RFP

(amounts in thousands)

Town	# Voters	# Voting Districts	# DRE			Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
			Active	Spares	Total needed		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
East Haddam	4,730	1	14	1	15	117	66	66	0	50
East Hampton	6,619	1	19	1	20	156	88	88	0	67
East Hartford	18,820	7	54	7	61	475	270	270	0	205
East Haven	12,066	7	35	7	42	327	186	186	0	141
East Lyme	9,525	3	28	3	31	241	137	137	0	104
East Windsor	4,754	2	14	2	16	125	71	71	0	54
Eastford	949	1	3	1	4	31	18	18	0	13
Easton	4,536	1	13	1	14	109	62	62	0	47
Ellington	7,452	2	22	2	24	187	106	106	0	81
Enfield	19,994	9	58	9	67	521	296	296	0	225
Essex	4,139	2	12	2	14	109	62	62	0	47
Fairfield	30,808	13	89	13	102	794	451	451	0	343
Farmington	13,773	4	40	4	44	342	195	195	0	148
Franklin	1,072	1	4	1	5	39	22	22	0	17
Glastonbury	19,211	9	55	9	64	498	283	283	0	215
Goshen	1,705	2	5	2	7	54	31	31	0	24
Granby	6,281	2	18	2	20	156	88	88	0	67
Greenwich	30,888	12	89	12	101	786	447	447	0	339
Griswold	4,581	2	14	2	16	125	71	71	0	54
Groton	14,856	8	43	8	51	397	226	226	0	171
Guilford	12,990	4	38	4	42	327	186	186	0	141
Haddam	4,532	2	13	2	15	117	66	66	0	50
Hamden	28,361	11	82	11	93	724	411	411	0	312
Hampton	1,085	1	4	1	5	39	22	22	0	17
Hartford	28,987	23	83	23	106	825	469	469	0	356
Hartland	1,179	1	4	1	5	39	22	22	0	17
Harwinton	3,173	2	10	2	12	93	53	53	0	40
Hebron	5,152	1	15	1	16	125	71	71	0	54
Kent	1,794	1	6	1	7	54	31	31	0	24
Killingly	6,534	5	19	5	24	187	106	106	0	81
Killingworth	3,845	1	11	1	12	93	53	53	0	40
Lebanon	3,858	1	12	1	13	101	57	57	0	44
Ledyard	7,217	2	21	2	23	179	102	102	0	77
Lisbon	2,054	1	6	1	7	54	31	31	0	24
Litchfield	4,345	4	13	4	17	132	75	75	0	57
Lyme	1,503	1	5	1	6	47	27	27	0	20
Madison	10,948	2	32	2	34	265	150	150	0	114
Manchester	23,643	10	68	10	78	607	345	345	0	262
Mansfield	8,627	3	25	3	28	218	124	124	0	94

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 1: All towns buy DREs from RFP

(amounts in thousands)

Town	# Voters	# Voting Districts	# DRE			Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
			Active	Spares	Total needed		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Marlborough	3,658	1	11	1	12	93	53	53	0	40
Meriden	22,893	20	66	20	86	669	380	380	0	289
Middlebury	4,112	1	12	1	13	101	57	57	0	44
Middlefield	2,649	1	8	1	9	70	40	40	0	30
Middletown	19,634	15	57	15	72	560	318	318	0	242
Milford	27,111	10	78	10	88	685	389	389	0	296
Monroe	10,715	4	31	4	35	272	155	155	0	118
Montville	7,987	6	23	6	29	226	128	128	0	97
Morris	1,403	1	5	1	6	47	27	27	0	20
Naugatuck	12,957	10	38	10	48	374	212	212	0	161
New Britain	21,384	15	62	15	77	599	341	341	0	259
New Canaan	11,085	3	32	3	35	272	155	155	0	118
New Fairfield	7,497	2	22	2	24	187	106	106	0	81
New Hartford	3,919	2	12	2	14	109	62	62	0	47
New Haven	39,458	52	113	52	165	1,284	730	730	0	554
New London	7,573	7	22	7	29	226	128	128	0	97
New Milford	13,314	7	39	7	46	358	203	203	0	155
Newington	16,261	8	47	8	55	428	243	243	0	185
Newtown	14,534	4	42	4	46	358	203	203	0	155
Norfolk	985	1	3	1	4	31	18	18	0	13
North Branford	7,377	2	22	2	24	187	106	106	0	81
North Canaan	1,543	1	5	1	6	47	27	27	0	20
North Haven	13,174	5	38	5	43	335	190	190	0	144
North Stonington	2,826	1	9	1	10	78	44	44	0	34
Norwalk	35,801	14	103	14	117	910	517	517	0	393
Norwich	14,036	10	41	10	51	397	226	226	0	171
Old Lyme	4,809	1	14	1	15	117	66	66	0	50
Old Saybrook	6,082	2	18	2	20	156	88	88	0	67
Orange	8,298	2	24	2	26	202	115	115	0	87
Oxford	6,046	1	18	1	19	148	84	84	0	64
Plainfield	6,117	4	18	4	22	171	97	97	0	74
Plainville	8,201	4	24	4	28	218	124	124	0	94
Plymouth	5,666	2	17	2	19	148	84	84	0	64
Pomfret	2,242	1	7	1	8	62	35	35	0	27
Portland	5,152	1	15	1	16	125	71	71	0	54
Preston	2,554	1	8	1	9	70	40	40	0	30
Prospect	5,079	2	15	2	17	132	75	75	0	57
Putnam	4,001	2	12	2	14	109	62	62	0	47
Redding	5,495	2	16	2	18	140	80	80	0	60

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 1: All towns buy DREs from RFP

(amounts in thousands)

Town	# Voters	# Voting Districts	# DRE			Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
			Active	Spares	Total needed		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Ridgefield	14,186	3	41	3	44	342	195	195	0	148
Rocky Hill	9,852	3	29	3	32	249	142	142	0	107
Roxbury	1,654	1	5	1	6	47	27	27	0	20
Salem	2,181	1	7	1	8	62	35	35	0	27
Salisbury	2,392	1	7	1	8	62	35	35	0	27
Scotland	881	1	3	1	4	31	18	18	0	13
Seymour	7,434	3	22	3	25	195	111	111	0	84
Sharon	1,623	1	5	1	6	47	27	27	0	20
Shelton	19,831	6	57	6	63	490	279	279	0	212
Sherman	2,125	2	7	2	9	70	40	40	0	30
Simsbury	14,074	4	41	4	45	350	199	199	0	151
Somers	4,557	1	14	1	15	117	66	66	0	50
South Windsor	14,123	7	41	7	48	374	212	212	0	161
Southbury	11,575	5	34	5	39	303	172	172	0	131
Southington	21,681	12	62	12	74	576	327	327	0	249
Sprague	1,375	1	4	1	5	39	22	22	0	17
Stafford	6,214	3	18	3	21	163	93	93	0	71
Stamford	47,496	23	136	23	159	1,237	703	703	0	534
Sterling	1,379	1	4	1	5	39	22	22	0	17
Stonington	9,926	5	29	5	34	265	150	150	0	114
Stratford	24,187	13	70	13	83	646	367	367	0	279
Suffield	7,013	1	21	1	22	171	97	97	0	74
Thomaston	3,956	1	12	1	13	101	57	57	0	44
Thompson	4,323	4	13	4	17	132	75	75	0	57
Tolland	8,166	2	24	2	26	202	115	115	0	87
Torrington	15,973	8	46	8	54	420	239	239	0	181
Trumbull	19,913	7	57	7	64	498	283	283	0	215
Union	485	1	2	1	3	23	13	13	0	10
Vernon	13,879	6	40	6	46	358	203	203	0	155
Voluntown	1,238	1	4	1	5	39	22	22	0	17
Wallingford	22,140	9	64	9	73	568	323	323	0	245
Warren	792	1	3	1	4	31	18	18	0	13
Washington	2,234	1	7	1	8	62	35	35	0	27
Waterbury	32,732	23	94	23	117	910	517	517	0	393
Waterford	10,454	4	30	4	34	265	150	150	0	114
Watertown	11,389	4	33	4	37	288	164	164	0	124
West Hartford	33,755	20	97	20	117	910	517	517	0	393
West Haven	21,368	10	62	10	72	560	318	318	0	242
Westbrook	3,782	2	11	2	13	101	57	57	0	44

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 1: All towns buy DREs from RFP

(amounts in thousands)

Town	# Voters	# Voting Districts	# DRE			Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
			Active	Spares	Total needed		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Weston	5,667	2	17	2	19	148	84	84	0	64
Westport	15,444	6	45	6	51	397	226	226	0	171
Wethersfield	16,472	10	48	10	58	451	257	257	0	195
Willington	3,060	1	9	1	10	78	44	44	0	34
Wilton	10,447	3	30	3	33	257	146	146	0	111
Winchester	5,273	1	16	1	17	132	75	75	0	57
Windham	8,187	5	24	5	29	226	128	128	0	97
Windsor	14,932	7	43	7	50	389	221	221	0	168
Windsor Locks	12,076	2	35	2	37	288	164	164	0	124
Wolcott	8,437	3	25	3	28	218	124	124	0	94
Woodbridge	5,511	1	16	1	17	132	75	75	0	57
Woodbury	5,881	2	17	2	19	148	84	84	0	64
Woodstock	4,304	1	13	1	14	109	62	62	0	47
TOTALS.....	1,607,808	769	4,683	769	5,452	42,427	24,113	24,113	0	18,314

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 2: Mixed DRE and OpScan

Town	Number of Voters	Number of Voting Districts	# DRE			# optical scanners				# privacy booths
			Active	Spares	Total needed	Active	Spares	Now owned	Total needed	Total needed
Andover	1,801	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	5
Ansonia	15,286	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	37
Ashford	2,309	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Avon	10,262	2	2	2	4	4	2		6	28
Barkhamsted	2,177	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	5
Beacon Falls	2,941	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	8
Berlin	10,754	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	26
Bethany	3,323	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	9
Bethel	9,622	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	23
Bethlehem	2,311	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Bloomfield	10,758	6	6	6	12	6	6		12	25
Bolton	3,078	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	8
Bozrah	1,421	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
Branford	14,950	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	36
Bridgeport	37,717	25	25	25	50	25	25		50	83
Bridgewater	1,185	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Bristol	25,349	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	63
Brookfield	8,892	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	24
Brooklyn	3,407	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	9
Burlington	5,146	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	14
Canaan	623	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	1
Canterbury	2,651	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	7
Canton	5,643	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	16
Chaplin	1,103	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Cheshire	15,064	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	37
Chester	2,227	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Clinton	6,928	1	1	1	2	3	1		4	19
Colchester	7,821	1	1	1	2	3	1		4	22
Colebrook	929	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
Columbia	3,142	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	8
Cornwall	952	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
Coventry	6,407	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	17
Cromwell	7,510	1	1	1	2	3	1		4	21
Danbury	26,248	16	16	16	32	16	16		32	59
Darien	11,134	6	6	6	12	6	6		12	26
Deep River	2,619	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	7
Derby	5,329	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	14
Durham	7,752	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	21
East Granby	2,794	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	6

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 2: Mixed DRE and OpScan

(amounts in thousands)

Town	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Andover	31	31	16	16	15
Ansonia	216	219	109	111	107
Ashford	31	31	16	16	16
Avon	80	63	31	32	49
Barkhamsted	60	63	31	32	29
Beacon Falls	32	31	16	16	16
Berlin	154	157	78	79	77
Bethany	32	31	16	16	16
Bethel	154	157	78	79	76
Bethlehem	31	31	16	16	16
Bloomfield	184	188	93	95	90
Bolton	32	31	16	16	16
Bozrah	31	31	16	16	15
Branford	216	219	109	111	107
Bridgeport	760	784	389	395	371
Bridgewater	30	31	16	16	15
Bristol	311	314	156	158	156
Brookfield	72	63	31	32	41
Brooklyn	39	31	16	16	23
Burlington	40	31	16	16	25
Canaan	30	31	16	16	14
Canterbury	31	31	16	16	16
Canton	41	31	16	16	25
Chaplin	30	31	16	16	15
Cheshire	216	219	109	111	107
Chester	31	31	16	16	16
Clinton	48	31	16	16	33
Colchester	49	31	16	16	34
Colebrook	30	31	16	16	15
Columbia	32	31	16	16	16
Cornwall	30	31	16	16	15
Coventry	63	63	31	32	32
Cromwell	49	31	16	16	33
Danbury	488	502	249	253	239
Darien	184	188	93	95	91
Deep River	31	31	16	16	16
Derby	63	63	31	32	32
Durham	71	63	31	32	40
East Granby	61	63	31	32	30

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 2: Mixed DRE and OpScan

Town	Number of Voters	Number of Voting Districts	# DRE			# optical scanners				# privacy booths
			Active	Spares	Total needed	Active	Spares	Now owned	Total needed	Total needed
East Haddam	4,730	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	13
East Hampton	6,619	1	1	1	2	3	1		4	18
East Hartford	18,820	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	47
East Haven	12,066	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	28
East Lyme	9,525	3	3	3	6	3	3	3	3	25
East Windsor	4,754	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	12
Eastford	949	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
Easton	4,536	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	12
Ellington	7,452	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	20
Enfield	19,994	9	9	9	18	9	9		18	49
Essex	4,139	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	10
Fairfield	30,808	13	13	13	26	13	13		26	76
Farmington	13,773	4	4	4	8	5	4		9	36
Franklin	1,072	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Glastonbury	19,211	9	9	9	18	9	9		18	46
Goshen	1,705	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	3
Granby	6,281	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	16
Greenwich	30,888	12	12	12	24	12	12		24	77
Griswold	4,581	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	12
Groton	14,856	8	8	8	16	8	8		16	35
Guilford	12,990	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	34
Haddam	4,532	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	11
Hamden	28,361	11	11	11	22	11	11		22	71
Hampton	1,085	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Hartford	28,987	23	23	23	46	23	23		46	60
Hartland	1,179	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Harwinton	3,173	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	8
Hebron	5,152	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	14
Kent	1,794	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	5
Killingly	6,534	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	14
Killingworth	3,845	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	10
Lebanon	3,858	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	11
Ledyard	7,217	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	19
Lisbon	2,054	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	5
Litchfield	4,345	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	9
Lyme	1,503	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
Madison	10,948	2	2	2	4	4	2		6	30
Manchester	23,643	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	58
Mansfield	8,627	3	3	3	6	3	3		6	22

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 2: Mixed DRE and OpScan

(amounts in thousands)

Town	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
East Haddam	40	31	16	16	24
East Hampton	48	31	16	16	33
East Hartford	219	219	109	111	110
East Haven	214	219	109	111	105
East Lyme	74	94	47	47	27
East Windsor	62	63	31	32	31
Eastford	30	31	16	16	15
Easton	40	31	16	16	24
Ellington	71	63	31	32	40
Enfield	278	282	140	142	138
Essex	62	63	31	32	31
Fairfield	403	408	202	205	201
Farmington	134	125	62	63	72
Franklin	30	31	16	16	15
Glastonbury	278	282	140	142	138
Goshen	60	63	31	32	29
Granby	63	63	31	32	32
Greenwich	374	376	187	190	187
Griswold	62	63	31	32	31
Groton	245	251	125	126	121
Guilford	127	125	62	63	65
Haddam	62	63	31	32	31
Hamden	343	345	171	174	172
Hampton	30	31	16	16	15
Hartford	695	721	358	363	337
Hartland	30	31	16	16	15
Harwinton	61	63	31	32	30
Hebron	40	31	16	16	25
Kent	31	31	16	16	15
Killingly	151	157	78	79	74
Killingworth	39	31	16	16	24
Lebanon	39	31	16	16	24
Ledyard	71	63	31	32	40
Lisbon	31	31	16	16	15
Litchfield	121	125	62	63	58
Lyme	31	31	16	16	15
Madison	81	63	31	32	50
Manchester	310	314	156	158	155
Mansfield	94	94	47	47	48

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 2: Mixed DRE and OpScan

Town	Number of Voters	Number of Voting Districts	# DRE			# optical scanners				# privacy booths
			Active	Spares	Total needed	Active	Spares	Now owned	Total needed	Total needed
Marlborough	3,658	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	10
Meriden	22,893	20	20	20	40	20	20		40	46
Middlebury	4,112	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	11
Middlefield	2,649	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	7
Middletown	19,634	15	15	15	30	15	15		30	42
Milford	27,111	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	68
Monroe	10,715	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	27
Montville	7,987	6	6	6	12	6	6		12	17
Morris	1,403	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
Naugatuck	12,957	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	28
New Britain	21,384	15	15	15	30	15	15		30	47
New Canaan	11,085	3	3	3	6	4	3		7	29
New Fairfield	7,497	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	20
New Hartford	3,919	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	10
New Haven	39,458	52	52	52	104	52	52		104	61
New London	7,573	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	15
New Milford	13,314	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	32
Newington	16,261	8	8	8	16	8	8		16	39
Newtown	14,534	4	4	4	8	5	4		9	38
Norfolk	985	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
North Branford	7,377	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	20
North Canaan	1,543	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
North Haven	13,174	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	33
North Stonington	2,826	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	8
Norwalk	35,801	14	14	14	28	14	14		28	89
Norwich	14,036	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	31
Old Lyme	4,809	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	13
Old Saybrook	6,082	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	16
Orange	8,298	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	22
Oxford	6,046	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	17
Plainfield	6,117	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	14
Plainville	8,201	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	20
Plymouth	5,666	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	15
Pomfret	2,242	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Portland	5,152	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	14
Preston	2,554	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	7
Prospect	5,079	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	13
Putnam	4,001	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	10
Redding	5,495	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	14

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 2: Mixed DRE and OpScan

(amounts in thousands)

Town	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Marlborough	39	31	16	16	24
Meriden	603	627	311	316	292
Middlebury	39	31	16	16	24
Middlefield	31	31	16	16	16
Middletown	454	470	233	237	221
Milford	313	314	156	158	157
Monroe	125	125	62	63	63
Montville	182	188	93	95	88
Morris	31	31	16	16	15
Naugatuck	303	314	156	158	147
New Britain	455	470	233	237	222
New Canaan	103	94	47	47	56
New Fairfield	71	63	31	32	40
New Hartford	62	63	31	32	31
New Haven	1,553	1,631	809	821	743
New London	211	219	109	111	102
New Milford	215	219	109	111	106
Newington	246	251	125	126	122
Newtown	135	125	62	63	73
Norfolk	30	31	16	16	15
North Branford	71	63	31	32	40
North Canaan	31	31	16	16	15
North Haven	156	157	78	79	78
North Stonington	32	31	16	16	16
Norwalk	436	439	218	221	218
Norwich	303	314	156	158	148
Old Lyme	26	31	16	16	10
Old Saybrook	63	63	31	32	32
Orange	72	63	31	32	41
Oxford	41	31	16	16	25
Plainfield	122	125	62	63	60
Plainville	123	125	62	63	61
Plymouth	63	63	31	32	32
Pomfret	31	31	16	16	16
Portland	40	31	16	16	25
Preston	31	31	16	16	16
Prospect	62	63	31	32	31
Putnam	62	63	31	32	31
Redding	63	63	31	32	32

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 2: Mixed DRE and OpScan

Town	Number of Voters	Number of Voting Districts	# DRE			# optical scanners				# privacy booths
			Active	Spares	Total needed	Active	Spares	Now owned	Total needed	Total needed
Ridgefield	14,186	3	3	3	6	5	3		8	38
Rocky Hill	9,852	3	3	3	6	3	3		6	26
Roxbury	1,654	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
Salem	2,181	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Salisbury	2,392	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Scotland	881	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
Seymour	7,434	3	3	3	6	3	3		6	19
Sharon	1,623	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
Shelton	19,831	6	6	6	12	6	6		12	51
Sherman	2,125	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	5
Simsbury	14,074	4	4	4	8	5	4		9	37
Somers	4,557	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	13
South Windsor	14,123	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	34
Southbury	11,575	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	29
Southington	21,681	12	12	12	24	12	12		24	50
Sprague	1,375	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Stafford	6,214	3	3	3	6	3	3		6	15
Stamford	47,496	23	23	23	46	23	23		46	113
Sterling	1,379	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Stonington	9,926	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	24
Stratford	24,187	13	13	13	26	13	13		26	57
Suffield	7,013	1	1	1	2	3	1		4	20
Thomaston	3,956	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	11
Thompson	4,323	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	9
Tolland	8,166	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	22
Torrington	15,973	8	8	8	16	8	8		16	38
Trumbull	19,913	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	50
Union	485	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	1
Vernon	13,879	6	6	6	12	6	6		12	34
Voluntown	1,238	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Wallingford	22,140	9	9	9	18	9	9		18	55
Warren	792	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
Washington	2,234	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Waterbury	32,732	23	23	23	46	23	23		46	71
Waterford	10,454	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	26
Watertown	11,389	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	29
West Hartford	33,755	20	20	20	40	20	20		40	77
West Haven	21,368	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	52
Westbrook	3,782	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	9

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 2: Mixed DRE and OpScan

(amounts in thousands)

Town	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Ridgefield	112	94	47	47	66
Rocky Hill	95	94	47	47	49
Roxbury	31	31	16	16	15
Salem	31	31	16	16	16
Salisbury	31	31	16	16	16
Scotland	30	31	16	16	15
Seymour	93	94	47	47	47
Sharon	31	31	16	16	15
Shelton	190	188	93	95	97
Sherman	60	63	31	32	29
Simsbury	135	125	62	63	72
Somers	40	31	16	16	24
South Windsor	215	219	109	111	107
Southbury	155	157	78	79	77
Southington	367	376	187	190	181
Sprague	30	31	16	16	15
Stafford	92	94	47	47	46
Stamford	708	721	358	363	350
Sterling	30	31	16	16	15
Stonington	154	157	78	79	76
Stratford	399	408	202	205	196
Suffield	49	31	16	16	33
Thomaston	39	31	16	16	24
Thompson	121	125	62	63	58
Tolland	72	63	31	32	41
Torrington	246	251	125	126	122
Trumbull	219	219	109	111	111
Union	30	31	16	16	14
Vernon	186	188	93	95	93
Voluntown	30	31	16	16	15
Wallingford	280	282	140	142	140
Warren	30	31	16	16	15
Washington	31	31	16	16	16
Waterbury	698	721	358	363	340
Waterford	125	125	62	63	63
Watertown	126	125	62	63	63
West Hartford	611	627	311	316	299
West Haven	309	314	156	158	153
Westbrook	47	63	31	32	16

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 2: Mixed DRE and OpScan

Town	Number of Voters	Number of Voting Districts	# DRE			# optical scanners				# privacy booths
			Active	Spares	Total needed	Active	Spares	Now owned	Total needed	Total needed
Weston	5,667	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	15
Westport	15,444	6	6	6	12	6	6		12	39
Wethersfield	16,472	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	38
Willington	3,060	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	8
Wilton	10,447	3	3	3	6	4	3		7	27
Winchester	5,273	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	15
Windham	8,187	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	19
Windsor	14,932	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	36
Windsor Locks	12,076	2	2	2	4	4	2		6	33
Wolcott	8,437	3	3	3	6	3	3		6	22
Woodbridge	5,511	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	15
Woodbury	5,881	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	15
Woodstock	4,304	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	12
TOTALS.....	1,607,808	769	769	769	1,538	818	769	7	1,580	3,914

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 2: Mixed DRE and OpScan

(amounts in thousands)

Town	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Weston	63	63	31	32	32
Westport	187	188	93	95	94
Wethersfield	305	314	156	158	150
Willington	32	31	16	16	16
Wilton	102	94	47	47	56
Winchester	40	31	16	16	25
Windham	153	157	78	79	75
Windsor	216	219	109	111	107
Windsor Locks	81	63	31	32	50
Wolcott	94	94	47	47	48
Woodbridge	40	31	16	16	25
Woodbury	63	63	31	32	32
Woodstock	40	31	16	16	24
TOTALS.....	24,007	24,113	11,969	12,145	12,039

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 3: Accessible OpScan

Town	Number of Voters	Number of Voting Districts	# ballot marking devices			# optical scanners				# privacy booths
			Active	Spares	Total needed	Active	Spares	Now owned	Total needed	Total needed
Andover	1,801	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	5
Ansonia	15,286	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	37
Ashford	2,309	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Avon	10,262	2	2	2	4	4	2		6	28
Barkhamsted	2,177	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	5
Beacon Falls	2,941	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	8
Berlin	10,754	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	26
Bethany	3,323	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	9
Bethel	9,622	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	23
Bethlehem	2,311	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Bloomfield	10,758	6	6	6	12	6	6		12	25
Bolton	3,078	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	8
Bozrah	1,421	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
Branford	14,950	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	36
Bridgeport	37,717	25	25	25	50	25	25		50	83
Bridgewater	1,185	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Bristol	25,349	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	63
Brookfield	8,892	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	24
Brooklyn	3,407	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	9
Burlington	5,146	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	14
Canaan	623	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	1
Canterbury	2,651	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	7
Canton	5,643	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	16
Chaplin	1,103	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Cheshire	15,064	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	37
Chester	2,227	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Clinton	6,928	1	1	1	2	3	1		4	19
Colchester	7,821	1	1	1	2	3	1		4	22
Colebrook	929	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
Columbia	3,142	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	8
Cornwall	952	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
Coventry	6,407	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	17
Cromwell	7,510	1	1	1	2	3	1		4	21
Danbury	26,248	16	16	16	32	16	16		32	59
Darien	11,134	6	6	6	12	6	6		12	26
Deep River	2,619	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	7
Derby	5,329	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	14
Durham	7,752	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	21
East Granby	2,794	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	6

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 3: Accessible OpScan

(amounts in thousands)

Town	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Andover	31	31	31	0	0
Ansonia	216	216	216	0	0
Ashford	31	31	31	0	0
Avon	80	80	80	0	0
Barkhamsted	60	60	60	0	0
Beacon Falls	32	32	32	0	0
Berlin	154	154	154	0	0
Bethany	39	39	39	0	0
Bethel	154	154	154	0	0
Bethlehem	31	31	31	0	0
Bloomfield	184	184	184	0	0
Bolton	39	39	39	0	0
Bozrah	31	31	31	0	0
Branford	216	216	216	0	0
Bridgeport	760	760	760	0	0
Bridgewater	30	30	30	0	0
Bristol	311	312	311	0	0
Brookfield	72	72	72	0	0
Brooklyn	39	39	39	0	0
Burlington	40	40	40	0	0
Canaan	30	30	30	0	0
Canterbury	31	31	31	0	0
Canton	41	41	41	0	0
Chaplin	30	30	30	0	0
Cheshire	216	216	216	0	0
Chester	31	31	31	0	0
Clinton	48	48	48	0	0
Colchester	49	49	49	0	0
Colebrook	30	30	30	0	0
Columbia	39	39	39	0	0
Cornwall	30	30	30	0	0
Coventry	70	70	70	0	0
Cromwell	49	49	49	0	0
Danbury	488	488	488	0	0
Darien	184	184	184	0	0
Deep River	31	31	31	0	0
Derby	63	63	63	0	0
Durham	71	71	71	0	0
East Granby	61	61	61	0	0

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 3: Accessible OpScan

Town	Number of Voters	Number of Voting Districts	# ballot marking devices			# optical scanners				# privacy booths
			Active	Spares	Total needed	Active	Spares	Now owned	Total needed	Total needed
East Haddam	4,730	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	13
East Hampton	6,619	1	1	1	2	3	1		4	18
East Hartford	18,820	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	47
East Haven	12,066	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	28
East Lyme	9,525	3	3	3	6	4	3	3	4	25
East Windsor	4,754	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	12
Eastford	949	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
Easton	4,536	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	12
Ellington	7,452	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	20
Enfield	19,994	9	9	9	18	9	9		18	49
Essex	4,139	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	10
Fairfield	30,808	13	13	13	26	13	13		26	76
Farmington	13,773	4	4	4	8	5	4		9	36
Franklin	1,072	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Glastonbury	19,211	9	9	9	18	9	9		18	46
Goshen	1,705	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	3
Granby	6,281	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	16
Greenwich	30,888	12	12	12	24	12	12		24	77
Griswold	4,581	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	12
Groton	14,856	8	8	8	16	8	8		16	35
Guilford	12,990	4	4	4	8	5	4		9	34
Haddam	4,532	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	11
Hamden	28,361	11	11	11	22	11	11		22	71
Hampton	1,085	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Hartford	28,987	23	23	23	46	23	23		46	60
Hartland	1,179	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Harwinton	3,173	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	8
Hebron	5,152	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	14
Kent	1,794	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	5
Killingly	6,534	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	14
Killingworth	3,845	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	10
Lebanon	3,858	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	11
Ledyard	7,217	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	19
Lisbon	2,054	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	5
Litchfield	4,345	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	9
Lyme	1,503	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
Madison	10,948	2	2	2	4	4	2		6	30
Manchester	23,643	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	58
Mansfield	8,627	3	3	3	6	3	3		6	22

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 3: Accessible OpScan

(amounts in thousands)

Town	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
East Haddam	40	40	40	0	0
East Hampton	48	48	48	0	0
East Hartford	219	219	219	0	0
East Haven	214	214	214	0	0
East Lyme	81	81	81	0	0
East Windsor	62	62	62	0	0
Eastford	30	30	30	0	0
Easton	40	40	40	0	0
Ellington	71	71	71	0	0
Enfield	278	279	278	0	0
Essex	62	62	62	0	0
Fairfield	403	404	403	0	0
Farmington	134	134	134	0	0
Franklin	30	30	30	0	0
Glastonbury	278	278	278	0	0
Goshen	60	60	60	0	0
Granby	70	70	70	0	0
Greenwich	374	374	374	0	0
Griswold	62	62	62	0	0
Groton	245	245	245	0	0
Guilford	134	134	134	0	0
Haddam	62	62	62	0	0
Hamden	343	343	343	0	0
Hampton	30	30	30	0	0
Hartford	695	695	695	0	0
Hartland	30	30	30	0	0
Harwinton	61	61	61	0	0
Hebron	40	40	40	0	0
Kent	31	31	31	0	0
Killingly	151	151	151	0	0
Killingworth	39	39	39	0	0
Lebanon	39	39	39	0	0
Ledyard	71	71	71	0	0
Lisbon	31	31	31	0	0
Litchfield	121	121	121	0	0
Lyme	31	31	31	0	0
Madison	81	81	81	0	0
Manchester	310	310	310	0	0
Mansfield	94	94	94	0	0

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 3: Accessible OpScan

Town	Number of Voters	Number of Voting Districts	# ballot marking devices			# optical scanners				# privacy booths
			Active	Spares	Total needed	Active	Spares	Now owned	Total needed	Total needed
Marlborough	3,658	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	10
Meriden	22,893	20	20	20	40	20	20		40	46
Middlebury	4,112	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	11
Middlefield	2,649	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	7
Middletown	19,634	15	15	15	30	15	15		30	42
Milford	27,111	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	68
Monroe	10,715	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	27
Montville	7,987	6	6	6	12	6	6		12	17
Morris	1,403	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
Naugatuck	12,957	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	28
New Britain	21,384	15	15	15	30	15	15		30	47
New Canaan	11,085	3	3	3	6	4	3		7	29
New Fairfield	7,497	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	20
New Hartford	3,919	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	10
New Haven	39,458	52	52	52	104	52	52		104	61
New London	7,573	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	15
New Milford	13,314	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	32
Newington	16,261	8	8	8	16	8	8		16	39
Newtown	14,534	4	4	4	8	5	4		9	38
Norfolk	985	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
North Branford	7,377	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	20
North Canaan	1,543	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
North Haven	13,174	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	33
North Stonington	2,826	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	8
Norwalk	35,801	14	14	14	28	14	14		28	89
Norwich	14,036	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	31
Old Lyme	4,809	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	13
Old Saybrook	6,082	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	16
Orange	8,298	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	22
Oxford	6,046	1	1	1	2	3	1		4	17
Plainfield	6,117	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	14
Plainville	8,201	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	20
Plymouth	5,666	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	15
Pomfret	2,242	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Portland	5,152	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	14
Preston	2,554	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	7
Prospect	5,079	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	13
Putnam	4,001	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	10
Redding	5,495	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	14

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 3: Accessible OpScan

(amounts in thousands)

Town	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Marlborough	39	39	39	0	0
Meriden	603	603	603	0	0
Middlebury	39	39	39	0	0
Middlefield	31	31	31	0	0
Middletown	454	454	454	0	0
Milford	313	313	313	0	0
Monroe	125	125	125	0	0
Montville	182	182	182	0	0
Morris	31	31	31	0	0
Naugatuck	303	303	303	0	0
New Britain	455	455	455	0	0
New Canaan	103	103	103	0	0
New Fairfield	71	71	71	0	0
New Hartford	62	62	62	0	0
New Haven	1,553	1,554	1,553	1	0
New London	211	211	211	0	0
New Milford	215	215	215	0	0
Newington	246	246	246	0	0
Newtown	135	135	135	0	0
Norfolk	30	30	30	0	0
North Branford	71	71	71	0	0
North Canaan	31	31	31	0	0
North Haven	156	156	156	0	0
North Stonington	32	32	32	0	0
Norwalk	436	436	436	0	0
Norwich	303	304	303	0	0
Old Lyme	26	26	26	0	0
Old Saybrook	70	70	70	0	0
Orange	72	72	72	0	0
Oxford	48	48	48	0	0
Plainfield	122	122	122	0	0
Plainville	123	123	123	0	0
Plymouth	63	63	63	0	0
Pomfret	31	31	31	0	0
Portland	40	40	40	0	0
Preston	31	31	31	0	0
Prospect	62	62	62	0	0
Putnam	62	62	62	0	0
Redding	63	63	63	0	0

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 3: Accessible OpScan

Town	Number of Voters	Number of Voting Districts	# ballot marking devices			# optical scanners				# privacy booths
			Active	Spares	Total needed	Active	Spares	Now owned	Total needed	Total needed
Ridgefield	14,186	3	3	3	6	5	3		8	38
Rocky Hill	9,852	3	3	3	6	4	3		7	26
Roxbury	1,654	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
Salem	2,181	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Salisbury	2,392	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Scotland	881	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
Seymour	7,434	3	3	3	6	3	3		6	19
Sharon	1,623	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	4
Shelton	19,831	6	6	6	12	7	6		13	51
Sherman	2,125	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	5
Simsbury	14,074	4	4	4	8	5	4		9	37
Somers	4,557	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	13
South Windsor	14,123	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	34
Southbury	11,575	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	29
Southington	21,681	12	12	12	24	12	12		24	50
Sprague	1,375	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Stafford	6,214	3	3	3	6	3	3		6	15
Stamford	47,496	23	23	23	46	23	23		46	113
Sterling	1,379	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Stonington	9,926	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	24
Stratford	24,187	13	13	13	26	13	13		26	57
Suffield	7,013	1	1	1	2	3	1		4	20
Thomaston	3,956	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	11
Thompson	4,323	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	9
Tolland	8,166	2	2	2	4	3	2		5	22
Torrington	15,973	8	8	8	16	8	8		16	38
Trumbull	19,913	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	50
Union	485	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	1
Vernon	13,879	6	6	6	12	6	6		12	34
Voluntown	1,238	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	3
Wallingford	22,140	9	9	9	18	9	9		18	55
Warren	792	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	2
Washington	2,234	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	6
Waterbury	32,732	23	23	23	46	23	23		46	71
Waterford	10,454	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	26
Watertown	11,389	4	4	4	8	4	4		8	29
West Hartford	33,755	20	20	20	40	20	20		40	77
West Haven	21,368	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	52
Westbrook	3,782	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	9

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 3: Accessible OpScan

(amounts in thousands)

Town	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Ridgefield	112	112	112	0	0
Rocky Hill	102	102	102	0	0
Roxbury	31	31	31	0	0
Salem	31	31	31	0	0
Salisbury	31	31	31	0	0
Scotland	30	30	30	0	0
Seymour	93	94	93	0	0
Sharon	31	31	31	0	0
Shelton	197	197	197	0	0
Sherman	60	60	60	0	0
Simsbury	135	135	135	0	0
Somers	40	40	40	0	0
South Windsor	215	216	215	0	0
Southbury	155	155	155	0	0
Southington	367	367	367	0	0
Sprague	30	30	30	0	0
Stafford	92	92	92	0	0
Stamford	708	709	708	0	0
Sterling	30	30	30	0	0
Stonington	154	154	154	0	0
Stratford	399	399	399	0	0
Suffield	49	49	49	0	0
Thomaston	39	39	39	0	0
Thompson	121	121	121	0	0
Tolland	72	72	72	0	0
Torrington	246	246	246	0	0
Trumbull	219	220	219	0	0
Union	30	30	30	0	0
Vernon	186	186	186	0	0
Voluntown	30	30	30	0	0
Wallingford	280	280	280	0	0
Warren	30	30	30	0	0
Washington	31	31	31	0	0
Waterbury	698	698	698	0	0
Waterford	125	125	125	0	0
Watertown	126	126	126	0	0
West Hartford	611	611	611	0	0
West Haven	309	309	309	0	0
Westbrook	47	47	47	0	0

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 3: Accessible OpScan

Town	Number of Voters	Number of Voting Districts	# ballot marking devices			# optical scanners				# privacy booths
			Active	Spares	Total needed	Active	Spares	Now owned	Total needed	Total needed
Weston	5,667	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	15
Westport	15,444	6	6	6	12	6	6		12	39
Wethersfield	16,472	10	10	10	20	10	10		20	38
Willington	3,060	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	8
Wilton	10,447	3	3	3	6	4	3		7	27
Winchester	5,273	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	15
Windham	8,187	5	5	5	10	5	5		10	19
Windsor	14,932	7	7	7	14	7	7		14	36
Windsor Locks	12,076	2	2	2	4	5	2		7	33
Wolcott	8,437	3	3	3	6	3	3		6	22
Woodbridge	5,511	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	15
Woodbury	5,881	2	2	2	4	2	2		4	15
Woodstock	4,304	1	1	1	2	2	1		3	12
TOTALS.....	1,607,808	769	769	769	1,538	831	769	7	1,593	3,914

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

Option 3: Accessible OpScan

(amounts in thousands)

Town	Total Cost	Use of HAVA funds			Cost borne by state or towns
		Town's share	Amount used	Residual	
Weston	63	63	63	0	0
Westport	187	187	187	0	0
Wethersfield	305	305	305	0	0
Willington	39	39	39	0	0
Wilton	102	103	102	0	0
Winchester	40	40	40	0	0
Windham	153	153	153	0	0
Windsor	216	216	216	0	0
Windsor Locks	88	88	88	0	0
Wolcott	94	94	94	0	0
Woodbridge	40	40	40	0	0
Woodbury	63	63	63	0	0
Woodstock	40	40	40	0	0
TOTALS.....	24,098	24,113	24,098	15	0

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

2004 VOTING MACHINE STATISTICS

Based on reports submitted to the Secretary of the State by the Town Clerks as of February, 2004

Town	1. Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Republican	Total Democratic	2. Total Minor Parties	Total Unaffiliated	Total Number of Names on Active Registry List	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares
Andover	1	511	624	5	877	2017	4	1
Ansonia	7	1391	3424	16	4274	9105	21	7
Ashford	1	492	852	9	1152	2505	4	1
Avon	2	3913	2456	12	4007	10388	22	9
Barkhamsted	2	702	555	12	1041	2310	5	2
Beacon Falls	1	738	943	3	1563	3247	8	4
Berlin	5	2880	4857	13	4029	11779	22	5
Bethany	1	1087	756	12	1692	3547	5	1
Bethel	5	2670	2506	15	5228	10419	18	4
Bethlehem	1	838	581	9	1218	2646	5	1
Bloomfield	6	1712	6893	8	4074	12687	20	6
Bolton	1	1036	888	7	1355	3286	6	1
Bozrah	1	311	613	1	664	1589	3	1
Branford	7	2801	5069	27	9361	17258	28	4
Bridgeport	25	5309	32520	98	15112	53039	122	69
Bridgewater	1	442	314	2	639	1397	4	2
Bristol	10	5221	12217	15	12105	29558	40	4
Brookfield	2	3808	1914	17	4000	9739	16	4
Brooklyn	1	848	1154	3	2122	4127	6	1
Burlington	1	1476	1414	23	2560	5473	7	1
Canaan	1	254	176	6	270	706	2	1
Canterbury	1	911	674	13	1504	3102	5	1
Canton	1	1774	1587	22	2373	5756	7	1
Chaplin	1	382	329	23	575	1309	3	1
Cheshire	7	4402	3532	24	8599	16557	29	6
Chester	1	574	710	5	1084	2373	4	1
Clinton	1	2294	2097	33	3685	8109	12	2
Colchester	1	1810	2394	9	3994	8207	11	0
Colebrook	1	262	307	4	494	1067	2	0
Columbia	1	756	1042	10	1416	3224	5	1
Cornwall	1	246	297	9	391	943	3	1

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

2004 VOTING MACHINE STATISTICS

Based on reports submitted to the Secretary of the State by the Town Clerks as of February, 2004

Town	1. Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Republican	Total Democratic	2. Total Minor Parties	Total Unaffiliated	Total Number of Names on Active Registry List	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares
Coventry	2	1400	1939	27	3505	6871	10	2
Cromwell	1	1840	2549	7	3786	8182	12	2
Danbury	16	6332	9013	230	13882	29457	44	3
Darien	6	6309	1738	13	3159	11219	22	4
Deep River	1	687	852	9	1451	2999	4	0
Derby	2	858	2896	7	2408	6169	14	7
Durham	2	1258	986	11	2263	4518	7	1
East Granby	2	909	718	5	1299	2931	5	1
East Haddam	1	1167	1488	5	2487	5147	6	1
East Hampton	1	1587	2106	23	3661	7377	11	2
East Hartford	7	3050	11811	32	9279	24172	51	20
East Haven	7	2353	5563	8	6495	14419	28	6
East Lyme	3	2627	2792	14	5161	10594	3	0
East Windsor	2	1182	1791	12	2648	5633	12	4
Eastford	1	393	240	1	390	1024	3	1
Easton	1	1776	910	5	2141	4832	7	0
Ellington	2	1788	1776	14	4152	7730	12	2
Enfield	9	4746	9160	47	11124	25077	39	8
Essex	2	1420	996	5	1894	4315	8	1
Fairfield	13	10591	7817	54	12693	31155	51	10
Farmington	4	4227	4086	18	6230	14561	21	3
Franklin	1	330	337	0	545	1212	4	2
Glastonbury	9	6217	5924	24	8244	20409	33	6
Goshen	2	766	381	3	766	1916	3	1
Granby	2	2282	1615	11	2896	6804	11	2
Greenwich	12	14035	6314	32	11340	31721	53	12
Griswold	2	1127	2755	3	2675	6560	13	2
Groton	8	3884	4562	38	8906	17390	29	6
Guilford	4	3758	3927	22	6733	14440	22	4
Haddam	2	1296	1509	11	2525	5341	11	3
Hamden	11	4865	11831	66	14273	31035	57	17

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

2004 VOTING MACHINE STATISTICS

Based on reports submitted to the Secretary of the State by the Town Clerks as of February, 2004

Town	1. Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Republican	Total Democratic	2. Total Minor Parties	Total Unaffiliated	Total Number of Names on Active Registry List	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares
Hampton	1	315	328	6	447	1096	3	1
Hartford	23	2318	30647	50	11695	44710	75	23
Hartland	1	626	319	4	498	1447	3	1
Harwinton	2	1067	860	4	1668	3599	7	2
Hebron	1	1476	1396	9	2734	5615	9	2
Kent	1	570	539	3	733	1845	4	1
Killingly	5	1498	2240	13	4315	8066	28	16
Killingworth	1	1106	810	4	2336	4256	7	2
Lebanon	1	1164	1067	11	2008	4250	9	2
Ledyard	2	2274	1726	17	3929	7946	13	2
Lisbon	1	449	795	1	1111	2356	5	1
Litchfield	4	2029	1320	20	2415	5784	11	2
Lyme	1	644	341	3	645	1633	4	1
Madison	2	4466	2557	57	5235	12315	19	2
Manchester	10	6300	10123	52	12138	28613	53	16
Mansfield	3	1181	2976	43	3151	7351	14	5
Marlborough	1	998	1055	5	1686	3744	6	1
Meriden	20	4188	8747	11	15441	28387	20	3
Middlebury	1	1696	815	5	1670	4186	8	2
Middlefield	1	594	879	5	1493	2971	7	3
Middletown	15	3565	10314	55	8209	22143	44	0
Milford	10	7116	7423	54	14787	29380	42	4
Monroe	4	3307	2097	7	6600	12011	18	3
Montville	6	1478	2476	7	4711	8672	20	6
Morris	1	674	313	0	529	1516		
Naugatuck	10	3110	5265	106	7272	15753	26	4
New Britain	15	3961	15988	244	8346	28539	87	20
New Canaan	3	6132	1941	19	3250	11342	19	5
New Fairfield	2	2846	1503	9	3964	8322	13	3
New Hartford	2	1239	998	22	1828	4087	8	2
New Haven	52	2379	36988	222	13114	52703	108	25

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

2004 VOTING MACHINE STATISTICS

Based on reports submitted to the Secretary of the State by the Town Clerks as of February, 2004

Town	1. Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Republican	Total Democratic	2. Total Minor Parties	Total Unaffiliated	Total Number of Names on Active Registry List	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares
New London	7	1228	3812	76	4154	9270	25	7
New Milford	7	4626	3393	35	7489	15543	22	2
Newington	8	3560	7663	19	6732	17974	37	4
Newtown	4	4909	3415	44	6603	14971	22	4
Norfolk	1	230	312	0	474	1016	3	1
North Branford	2	1732	1660	15	4719	8126	14	4
North Canaan	1	496	332	11	847	1686	4	1
North Haven	5	4208	2826	12	7778	14824	10	5
North Stonington	1	875	713	4	1512	3104	5	1
Norwalk	14	9519	12101	703	18245	40568	65	14
Norwich	10	2668	6954	39	8185	17846	27	5
Old Lyme	1	1975	1278	5	2412	5670	2	1
Old Saybrook	2	2558	1502	10	2759	6829	11	2
Orange	2	2534	1923	5	4740	9202	13	2
Oxford	1	1980	1055	88	3594	6717	10	2
Plainfield	4	1324	3017	22	3720	8083	14	3
Plainville	4	2018	3436	9	3784	9247	16	4
Plymouth	2	1369	1717	11	3737	6834	15	7
Pomfret	1	722	640	10	1103	2475	4	1
Portland	1	1186	2028	23	2625	5862	10	2
Preston	1	860	668	7	1509	3044	4	0
Prospect	2	1714	1097	6	2679	5496	11	4
Putnam	2	807	1776	15	1866	4464	9	3
Redding	2	2205	1367	6	2225	5803	8	1
Ridgefield	3	6410	3604	86	5392	15492	22	3
Rocky Hill	3	2160	3891	7	3988	10046	19	6
Roxbury	1	516	372	9	647	1544	3	1
Salem	1	567	730	8	1044	2349	4	1
Salisbury	1	751	684	8	978	2421	5	1
Scotland	1	226	306	5	381	918	2	1
Seymour	3	1860	1745	9	4744	8358	15	3

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

2004 VOTING MACHINE STATISTICS

Based on reports submitted to the Secretary of the State by the Town Clerks as of February, 2004

Town	1. Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Republican	Total Democratic	2. Total Minor Parties	Total Unaffiliated	Total Number of Names on Active Registry List	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares
Sharon	1	697	401	5	688	1791	3	1
Shelton	6	6524	4732	22	13765	25043	37	6
Sherman	2	873	410	6	990	2279	4	1
Simsbury	4	5902	3875	27	5699	15503	23	3
Somers	1	1417	1287	0	2770	5474	9	2
South Windsor	7	3617	5190	21	6166	14994	21	2
Southbury	5	4616	2317	11	5893	12837	22	6
Southington	12	5532	7547	22	12060	25161	46	11
Sprague	1	298	659	8	631	1596	5	3
Stafford	3	1108	2971	11	3014	7104	15	3
Stamford	23	14088	20811	240	17393	52532	96	23
Sterling	1	355	334	7	897	1593	3	1
Stonington	5	2581	3237	25	5617	11460	18	2
Stratford	13	5099	7585	52	14512	27248	52	15
Suffield	1	2299	1905	17	3335	7556	13	1
Thomaston	1	1156	1145	13	2234	4548	7	1
Thompson	4	902	1820	37	2114	4873	12	5
Tolland	2	2065	2136	8	4428	8637	11	1
Torrington	8	4482	6004	30	7359	17875	31	8
Trumbull	7	6117	5181	15	11461	22774	34	6
Union	1	217	114	3	174	508	3	1
Vernon	6	2894	3945	14	7408	14261	31	10
Voluntown	1	309	471	4	672	1456	3	1
Wallingford	9	4538	6630	29	13615	24812	41	8
Warren	1	322	139	0	348	809	4	1
Washington	1	792	556	10	874	2232	4	1
Waterbury	23	7956	23715	256	18684	50611	102	9
Waterford	4	2448	3283	15	6045	11791	20	4
Watertown	4	3267	3161	27	6471	12926	20	4
West Hartford	20	8181	15673	56	13291	37201	73	3
West Haven	10	3203	15528	59	8142	26932	48	8

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

2004 VOTING MACHINE STATISTICS

Based on reports submitted to the Secretary of the State by the Town Clerks as of February, 2004

Town	1. Total Number of Voting Districts	Total Republican	Total Democratic	2. Total Minor Parties	Total Unaffiliated	Total Number of Names on Active Registry List	Total Number of Voting Machines, incl. spares	Total Spares
Westbrook	2	1166	811	4	1871	3852	2	0
Weston	2	2132	1666	8	2285	6091	10	2
Westport	6	5420	4839	18	5577	15854	28	8
Wethersfield	10	3777	6483	27	6288	16575	34	10
Willington	1	699	807	57	1571	3134	5	1
Wilton	3	4419	2253	18	3720	10410	16	2
Winchester	1	1376	1743	16	3420	6555	10	2
Windham	5	1609	5094	84	5100	11887	19	3
Windsor	7	3009	6753	27	7225	17014	32	5
Windsor Locks	2	1325	2373	7	3197	6902	12	2
Wolcott	3	2500	2492	30	4723	9745	15	3
Woodbridge	1	1426	1573	4	2542	5545	9	2
Woodbury	2	2383	1183	8	2256	5830	10	2
Woodstock	1	1638	1187	18	1814	4657	7	1
TOTALS.....	769	422,204	626,959	4,973	777,431	1,831,567	3,196	726

1. Number of voting districts listed as reported by Town Clerks. In some cases the actual number used in 2004 may vary.
 2. Number of enrolled in minor parties listed as reported Town Clerks. In some town the actual number may vary per statutory definition of official minor-party status.
- * One or more additional machines-in-use needed, or existing machines (including spares) redistributed.
 ** One or more additional spare machines needed, or existing machines redistributed.

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

November 02, 2004 General Election Statistics

Last updated date/time: 11/29/2004 9:12:34 AM November 02, 2004

Summarized by TOWN

Town	Names On Official Check List	Number Checked As Having Voted	Percentage Checked As Having Voted	Number Of Absentee Ballot Received From Town Clerk	Number Of Absentee Ballot Rejected	Number Of Absentee Ballot Voted
Andover	2,146	1,801	83.92%	105	1	104
Ansonia	19,358	15,286	78.96%	1,330	16	1,314
Ashford	2,789	2,309	82.79%	156	11	145
Avon	11,683	10,262	87.84%	1,172	23	1,149
Barkhamsted	2,575	2,177	84.54%	133	1	132
Beacon Falls	3,517	2,941	83.62%	190	3	187
Berlin	12,805	10,754	83.98%	784	4	780
Bethany	3,771	3,323	88.12%	280	6	274
Bethel	11,278	9,622	85.32%	883	18	865
Bethlehem	2,806	2,311	82.36%	185	5	180
Bloomfield	13,991	10,758	76.89%	1,373	41	1,332
Bolton	3,515	3,078	87.57%	220	5	215
Bozrah	1,693	1,421	83.93%	115	5	110
Branford	19,167	14,950	78.00%	1,396	28	1,368
Bridgeport	59,102	37,717	63.82%	1,905	46	1,859
Bridgewater	1,439	1,185	82.35%	121	2	119
Bristol	32,880	25,349	77.10%	2,004	41	1,963
Brookfield	10,592	8,892	83.95%	832	10	822
Brooklyn	4,593	3,407	74.18%	239	11	228
Burlington	6,098	5,146	84.39%	364	3	361
Canaan	768	623	81.12%	106	3	103
Canterbury	3,330	2,651	79.61%	195	3	192
Canton	6,488	5,643	86.98%	520	12	508
Chaplin	1,413	1,103	78.06%	82	3	79
Cheshire	17,825	15,064	84.51%	1,484	33	1,451
Chester	2,603	2,227	85.56%	209	5	204
Clinton	8,891	6,928	77.92%	545	4	541
Colchester	9,296	7,821	84.13%	552	15	537
Colebrook	1,136	929	81.78%	86	1	85
Columbia	3,584	3,142	87.67%	221	3	218
Cornwall	1,062	952	89.64%	154	1	153

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

November 02, 2004 General Election Statistics

Last updated date/time: 11/29/2004 9:12:34 AM November 02, 2004

Summarized by TOWN

Town	Names On Official Check List	Number Checked As Having Voted	Percentage Checked As Having Voted	Number Of Absentee Ballot Received From Town Clerk	Number Of Absentee Ballot Rejected	Number Of Absentee Ballot Voted
Coventry	7,772	6,407	82.44%	416	2	414
Cromwell	9,025	7,510	83.21%	723	8	715
Danbury	32,697	26,248	80.28%	2,360	85	2,275
Darien	12,307	11,134	90.47%	1,466	17	1,449
Deep River	3,209	2,619	81.61%	220	3	217
Derby	6,773	5,329	78.68%	369	5	364
Durham	9,688	7,752	80.02%	556	2	554
East Granby	3,333	2,794	83.83%	238	12	226
East Haddam	5,834	4,730	81.08%	356	14	342
East Hampton	8,240	6,619	80.33%	491	4	487
East Hartford	26,499	18,820	71.02%	1,430	33	1,397
East Haven	16,052	12,066	75.17%	877	21	856
East Lyme	11,534	9,525	82.58%	1,043	18	1,025
East Windsor	6,504	4,754	73.09%	408	15	393
Eastford	1,114	949	85.19%	76	1	75
Easton	5,265	4,536	86.15%	425	2	427
Ellington	8,805	7,452	84.63%	505	1	504
Enfield	27,108	19,994	73.76%	1,405	33	1,372
Essex	4,697	4,139	88.12%	456	2	458
Fairfield	35,617	30,808	86.50%	3,469	0	3,469
Farmington	16,138	13,773	85.35%	1,467	22	1,445
Franklin	1,272	1,072	84.28%	62	0	62
Glastonbury	22,135	19,211	86.79%	1,813	31	1,782
Goshen	2,008	1,705	84.91%	193	3	190
Granby	7,364	6,281	85.29%	493	12	481
Greenwich	34,933	30,888	88.42%	3,805	62	3,743
Griswold	6,395	4,581	71.63%	306	2	304
Groton	19,684	14,856	75.47%	1,711	45	1,666
Guilford	15,717	12,990	82.65%	1,353	90	1,263
Haddam	5,524	4,532	82.04%	344	9	335
Hamden	34,315	28,361	82.65%	2,603	48	2,555

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

November 02, 2004 General Election Statistics

Last updated date/time: 11/29/2004 9:12:34 AM November 02, 2004

Summarized by TOWN

Town	Names On Official Check List	Number Checked As Having Voted	Percentage Checked As Having Voted	Number Of Absentee Ballot Received From Town Clerk	Number Of Absentee Ballot Rejected	Number Of Absentee Ballot Voted
Hampton	1,222	1,085	88.79%	77	0	77
Hartford	49,803	28,987	58.20%	2,260	73	2,187
Hartland	1,485	1,179	79.39%	90	4	86
Harwinton	3,791	3,173	83.70%	231	2	229
Hebron	6,086	5,152	84.65%	373	6	367
Kent	2,091	1,794	85.80%	272	8	264
Killingly	8,976	6,534	72.79%	568	12	556
Killingworth	4,596	3,845	83.66%	318	11	307
Lebanon	4,683	3,858	82.38%	287	1	286
Ledyard	8,816	7,217	81.86%	665	13	652
Lisbon	2,529	2,054	81.22%	147	2	145
Litchfield	6,216	4,345	69.90%	345	13	332
Lyme	1,773	1,503	84.77%	176	4	172
Madison	13,266	10,948	82.53%	1,217	11	1,206
Manchester	32,142	23,643	73.56%	2,180	39	2,141
Mansfield	10,359	8,627	83.28%	750	12	738
Marlborough	4,174	3,658	87.64%	301	8	293
Meriden	31,278	22,893	73.19%	2,027	40	1,987
Middlebury	4,694	4,112	87.60%	389	6	383
Middlefield	3,119	2,649	84.93%	214	7	207
Middletown	24,867	19,634	78.96%	1,830	23	1,807
Milford	32,377	27,111	83.74%	2,047	9	2,038
Monroe	12,766	10,715	83.93%	940	11	929
Montville	9,571	7,987	83.45%	689	2	687
Morris	1,664	1,403	84.31%	172	4	168
Naugatuck	17,468	12,957	74.18%	1,024	32	992
New Britain	30,925	21,384	69.15%	1,744	43	1,701
New Canaan	12,759	11,085	86.88%	1,608	25	1,583
New Fairfield	9,178	7,497	81.68%	707	3	704
New Hartford	4,585	3,919	85.47%	330	6	224
New Haven	58,094	39,458	67.92%	3,306	44	3,259

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

November 02, 2004 General Election Statistics

Last updated date/time: 11/29/2004 9:12:34 AM November 02, 2004

Summarized by TOWN

Town	Names On Official Check List	Number Checked As Having Voted	Percentage Checked As Having Voted	Number Of Absentee Ballot Received From Town Clerk	Number Of Absentee Ballot Rejected	Number Of Absentee Ballot Voted
New London	11,124	7,573	68.08%	644	8	636
New Milford	17,505	13,314	76.06%	1,224	30	1,194
Newington	19,279	16,261	84.35%	1,586	18	1,568
Newtown	16,598	14,534	87.56%	1,257	7	1,250
Norfolk	1,116	985	88.26%	116	7	109
North Branford	8,743	7,377	84.38%	724	7	717
North Canaan	1,971	1,543	78.29%	186	2	184
North Haven	16,095	13,174	81.85%	1,092	16	1,076
North Stonington	3,512	2,826	80.47%	259	3	256
Norwalk	47,651	35,801	75.13%	3,044	116	2,928
Norwich	19,880	14,036	70.60%	1,159	1	1,158
Old Lyme	5,984	4,809	80.36%	548	0	548
Old Saybrook	7,395	6,082	82.24%	742	14	728
Orange	9,737	8,298	85.22%	813	5	808
Oxford	7,341	6,046	82.36%	405	2	403
Plainfield	8,858	6,117	69.06%	443	3	440
Plainville	10,557	8,201	77.68%	563	10	553
Plymouth	7,563	5,666	74.92%	346	4	342
Pomfret	2,779	2,242	80.68%	228	8	220
Portland	6,357	5,152	81.04%	462	4	458
Preston	3,355	2,554	76.13%	198	0	198
Prospect	5,803	5,079	87.52%	105	1	104
Putnam	5,010	4,001	79.86%	322	6	316
Redding	6,318	5,495	86.97%	647	15	632
Ridgefield	16,909	14,186	83.90%	1,805	32	1,773
Rocky Hill	11,615	9,852	84.82%	954	22	932
Roxbury	1,870	1,654	88.45%	193	1	192
Salem	2,630	2,181	82.93%	180	9	171
Salisbury	2,815	2,392	84.97%	379	13	366
Scotland	1,064	881	82.80%	64	0	64
Seymour	9,123	7,434	81.49%	560	11	549

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

November 02, 2004 General Election Statistics

Last updated date/time: 11/29/2004 9:12:34 AM November 02, 2004

Summarized by TOWN

Town	Names On Official Check List	Number Checked As Having Voted	Percentage Checked As Having Voted	Number Of Absentee Ballot Received From Town Clerk	Number Of Absentee Ballot Rejected	Number Of Absentee Ballot Voted
Sharon	1,974	1,623	82.22%	226	3	223
Shelton	24,294	19,831	81.63%	1,556	41	1,515
Sherman	2,577	2,125	82.46%	263	7	256
Simsbury	17,073	14,074	82.43%	1,556	57	1,499
Somers	5,958	4,557	76.49%	395	8	387
South Windsor	16,177	14,123	87.30%	1,197	20	1,177
Southbury	13,992	11,575	82.73%	1,240	14	1,226
Southington	27,134	21,681	79.90%	1,635	38	1,597
Sprague	1,657	1,375	82.98%	134	4	130
Stafford	7,464	6,214	83.25%	563	14	549
Stamford	59,357	47,496	80.02%	4,726	113	4,613
Sterling	1,870	1,379	73.74%	102	4	98
Stonington	12,449	9,926	79.73%	1,078	18	1,060
Stratford	32,691	24,187	73.99%	1,977	57	1,920
Suffield	8,558	7,013	81.95%	649	11	638
Thomaston	4,942	3,956	80.05%	312	5	307
Thompson	5,233	4,323	82.61%	296	11	285
Tolland	9,430	8,166	86.60%	611	2	609
Torrington	19,446	15,973	82.14%	1,607	33	1,574
Trumbull	24,267	19,913	82.06%	1,818	34	1,784
Union	548	485	88.50%	46	0	46
Vernon	16,625	13,879	83.48%	1,213	28	1,185
Voluntown	1,565	1,238	79.11%	89	3	86
Wallingford	27,265	22,140	81.20%	1,924	60	1,864
Warren	909	792	87.13%	78	0	78
Washington	2,400	2,234	93.08%	298	4	294
Waterbury	55,004	32,732	59.51%	2,225	65	2,160
Waterford	12,925	10,454	80.88%	1,010	20	990
Watertown	14,078	11,389	80.90%	720	6	714
West Hartford	40,270	33,755	83.82%	3,524	51	3,473
West Haven	30,050	21,368	71.11%	1,787	48	1,739

TrueVoteCT Voting Machine Costs Projection

November 02, 2004 General Election Statistics

Last updated date/time: 11/29/2004 9:12:34 AM November 02, 2004

Summarized by TOWN

Town	Names On Official Check List	Number Checked As Having Voted	Percentage Checked As Having Voted	Number Of Absentee Ballot Received From Town Clerk	Number Of Absentee Ballot Rejected	Number Of Absentee Ballot Voted
Westbrook	4,222	3,782	89.58%	351	4	345
Weston	6,278	5,667	90.27%	840	9	831
Westport	17,652	15,444	87.49%	2,258	40	2,218
Wethersfield	18,135	16,472	90.83%	1,124	10	1,114
Willington	3,630	3,060	84.30%	228	5	223
Wilton	11,766	10,447	88.79%	1,470	21	1,449
Winchester	7,090	5,273	74.37%	433	6	427
Windham	14,035	8,187	58.33%	632	15	617
Windsor	18,568	14,932	80.42%	1,339	17	1,322
Windsor Locks	14,986	12,076	80.58%	884	8	876
Wolcott	10,234	8,437	82.44%	558	8	550
Woodbridge	6,162	5,511	89.44%	771	39	732
Woodbury	6,635	5,881	88.64%	533	9	524
Woodstock	4,944	4,304	87.06%	394	3	391
TOTALS	2,044,181	1,607,808	78.65%	144,582	2,787	141,698