

Exhibit 6

From: Terri Haarstad [mailto:thaarstad@ci.minnetrista.mn.us]
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2008 4:21 PM
To: Jim Gelbmann
Cc: Tony Trimble; Lillehaug, David
Subject: RE: Updated Information on Sorting of Rejected Absentee Ballots

Hello.

On the on-line survey requested by the Canvassing Board, Minnetrista left Category 5 blank as Categories 1 -4 do not address all legal and valid reasons why an absentee ballot may be properly rejected. As such, Minnetrista created their own categories for ballots rejected under MS§ 203B.08 subd. 4, MS§ 203B.08 subd. 1, MS§ 203B.07 subd. 3, MN Rules 8210.2200 and MN Rules 8210.2500. A summary of the results of our review are attached for your convenience. Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

Have a good weekend.

Terri Haarstad
City Clerk

City of Minnetrista (Population est. 6,234)
7701 County Road 110 W
Minnetrista, MN 55364
952.446.1660 phone
952.446.1311 fax

All government data is available for viewing at City Hall during normal business hours, Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm. Copies of non-copyrighted public data are available in the format in which the data is maintained. In compliance with the 2008 fee schedule, there is a charge of \$0.25 per single-sided 8.5" x 11" black and white page in addition to shipping/ mailing costs. Data requests for more than 100 pages may result in charges for staff time. If the data you request is maintained electronically, is less than 5MB, and takes less than one (1) hour to compile, that data will be released free of charge. Please visit our website at www.ci.minnetrista.mn.us to view our complete data practices policy and/or to download data request forms.

Information is the currency of democracy. - Thomas Jefferson

From: Jim Gelbmann [mailto:Jim.Gelbmann@state.mn.us]
Sent: Sunday, December 07, 2008 12:29 AM
To: Jim Gelbmann; 'phil thompson'; 'Jim Gelbmann'; 'Dennis Distad'; 'Tony P. Trimble'; 'allen.paulson@co.clearwater.mn.us'; 'anne.granitz@co.roseau.mn.us'; 'barb.loch@co.meeker.mn.us'; 'becky.murphy@co.beltrami.mn.us'; 'ben.pribyl@co.jackson.mn.us'; 'elections@co.cook.mn.us';

12/14/2008

'election@co.nicollet.mn.us'; 'byron.giese@co.swift.mn.us'; 'carolyn.holmsten@co.goodhue.mn.us';
 'auditor@co.grant.mn.us'; 'char.meiners@co.houston.mn.us'; 'charleen.west@co.wadena.mn.us';
 'cmaclennan@co.winona.mn.us'; 'cindy.schultz@co.mcleod.mn.us'; 'cwcauditor@co.crow-wing.mn.us';
 'denise.cooper@co.kanabec.mn.us'; 'djfreed@co.chisago.mn.us'; 'auditor@co.sherburne.mn.us'; 'dicklichd@co.st-louis.mn.us';
 'auditor@co.watonwan.mn.us'; 'donna.quandt@co.pope.mn.us'; 'doug@co.mower.mn.us';
 'rcelections@co.rice.mn.us'; 'frank.thompson@co.mahnomen.mn.us'; 'gerald.amiot@co.polk.mn.us';
 'gloria.rolfs@co.rock.mn.us'; 'hwinter@co.murray.mn.us'; 'jake.sieg@lqpc.com';
 'james.forshee@co.martin.mn.us'; 'jan.h.johnson@co.cottonwood.mn.us'; 'jleisen@co.wabasha.mn.us';
 'joan.manthe@co.waseca.mn.us'; 'jneynsen@co.benton.mn.us'; 'elections@CO.DAKOTA.MN.US';
 'john_h@co.lake-of-the-woods.mn.us'; 'john.thompson@co.faribault.mn.us'; 'jclauson@co.chippewa.mn.us';
 'elections@co.ramsey.mn.us'; 'joyce.steinhoff@co.pipestone.mn.us'; 'karen.busch@co.todd.mn.us';
 'kschreurs@co.lincoln.mn.us'; 'ktolson@co.pennington.mn.us'; 'elections@co.washington.mn.us';
 'kpeysar@co.aitkin.mn.us'; 'kit.johnson@co.traverse.mn.us'; 'larry_b@CO.REDWOOD.MN.US';
 'larry_j@co.renville.mn.us'; 'laura.ihrke@CO.STEELE.MN.US'; 'lengelen@co.carver.mn.us';
 'pfarl@co.sibley.mn.us'; 'lois.bonde@co.yellow-medicine.mn.us'; 'lori.johnson@co.clay.mn.us';
 'mgustafson@co.kittson.mn.us'; 'marlin.helget@co.brown.mn.us'; 'marsha.goslovich@co.itasca.mn.us';
 'mkes@co.scott.mn.us'; 'Vote@co.hennepin.mn.us'; 'michelle_k@co.big-stone.mn.us';
 'neilwiese@co.stevens.mn.us'; 'fuller.pamela@co.olmsted.mn.us'; 'pheeren@co.hubbard.mn.us';
 'patty.oconnor@co.blue-earth.mn.us'; 'paul.gassert@co.carlton.mn.us'; 'paulavanoverbeke@co.lyon.mn.us';
 'elections@co.anoka.mn.us'; 'elections@co.stearns.mn.us'; 'rick.munter@co.norman.mn.us';
 'bob.hiivala@co.wright.mn.us'; 'bob.peterson@co.koochiching.mn.us'; 'raschmitz@co.red-lake.mn.us';
 'cblaschko@co.le-sueur.mn.us'; 'russn@co.morrison.mn.us'; 'rltange@co.becker.mn.us';
 'sam_m@co.kandiyohi.mn.us'; 'sara.marquardt@co.dodge.mn.us'; 'scott.peters@co.marshall.mn.us';
 'cass.voter@co.cass.mn.us'; 'sbalster@co.nobles.mn.us'; 'sboelter@co.fillmore.mn.us';
 'steve.mcmahon@co.lake.mn.us'; 'terry.treichel@co.isanti.mn.us'; 't.reddick@mail.co.douglas.mn.us';
 'wbezenek@co.wilkin.mn.us'; 'wstein@co.ottertail.mn.us'; 'kay.mack@co.beltrami.mn';
 'CCJohnso@co.pine.mn.us'; 'tferber@ci.bloomington.mn.us'; 'kengberg@ci.bloomington.mn.us';
 'tmarshall@ci.robinsdale.mn.us'; 'tgerhardt@ci.chanhassen.mn.us'; 'doboszanski@ci.rogers.mn.us';
 'sjenkins@townofhassan.com'; 'sknutson@ci.brooklyn-center.mn.us'; 'sengdahl@ci.plymouth.mn.us';
 'sborders@cityofdayton.mn.com'; 'rcolotti@ci.champlin.mn.us'; 'greenwood@visi.com';
 'ngibbs@cityofrichfield.org'; 'nacyc@cityofrockford.org'; 'llarson@ci.osseo.mn.us';
 'kbachmeier@ci.corcoran.mn.us'; 'kporta@edenprairie.org'; 'janet.lewis@ci.crystal.mn.us';
 'devin.montero@brooklynpark.org'; 'daniel-hanover@comcast.net'; 'danay@cityofdeephaven.org';
 'cheri@ci.excelsior.mn.us'; 'johnson@ci.greenfield.mn.us'; 'terry@hopkinsmn.com';
 'thirsch@ci.independence.mn.us'; 'jmoeller@ci.long-lake.mn.us'; 'cpatnode@ci.loretto.mn.us';
 'skollanderson@ci.maple-grove.mn.us'; 'cityhall@mapleplain.com'; 'chad.adams@ci.medina.mn.us';
 'dmaeda@eminnetonka.com'; 'mregnier@ci.minnetonka-beach.mn.us'; Terri Haarstad;
 'bonnieritter@cityofmound.com'; 'vleone@ci.new-hope.mn.us'; 'lv@ci.orono.mn.us'; 'stboni@visi.com';
 'jpanchyshyn@ci.shorewood.mn.us'; 'wlewin@mchsi.com'; 'clink@cityoftonkabay.net'; 'sandy@wayzata.org';
 'shelley@cityofwoodlandmn.org'; 'Michelle.DesJardin@co.hennepin.mn.us'; 'NSTROTH@stlouispark.org'

Cc: 'fknaak@klaw.us'; 'Lillehaug, David'; 'Tony P. Trimble'; Marc Elias

Subject: Updated Information on Sorting of Rejected Absentee Ballots

Good Morning Everyone:

After the flurry of e-mails Thursday morning about the sorting of rejected absentee ballots into five categories, I want to extend my most heartfelt thanks to everyone who has agreed to help us with this task. The State Canvassing Board has requested this information, and without your assistance, the Office of the Secretary of State would not be able to provide adequate information to the Board. I do understand how overworked everyone is and I do feel very guilty asking for you to complete yet another task that many felt you have already done. I hope the Detailed Instructions sent out Thursday help explain the reason for, and the parameters of, this task. Houston County had a public sort on Friday, and while they did not have many rejected absentee ballots, they did identify two of fifteen that were mistakenly rejected and placed in category five.

ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

Web Link For Reporting Results

12/14/2008

We have established a Web Link for reporting the results of your sort to our Office. We ask that you complete the Web Survey and also mail or fax us a signed hard copy so we have it for our records. The Web Link for reporting your results also includes an area for comments in case there are specific circumstances that created confusion as to which category a rejected absentee ballot should be placed. The Web Link is as follows:

http://www.sos.state.mn.us/survey/user_survey.asp?nSurvey=156

I have also attached a Word Document that contains a worksheet that may help you complete the survey.

Clarifications To Detailed Instructions

Based on feedback from county and city election officials the following clarifications may assist you in understanding the process.

The Heading on Section I of the process currently reads:

I. Previously-rejected non-UOCAVA absentee ballot envelopes not processed for acceptance or rejection by an absentee ballot board (accepted and rejected in the precinct)

A more precise heading should read:

I. Previously-rejected non-UOCAVA absentee ballot envelopes either (1) rejected by an absentee ballot board or (2) not processed by an absentee ballot board and rejected in the precinct

Another legitimate reason for rejecting a UOCAVA absentee ballot is that the voter did not submit an application (the Federal Post Card Application) -- this is a possibility in cases in which the voter only submits the Federal Write-in Absentee Ballot. Please allocate any appropriately rejected UOCAVA ballots that were rejected for lack of an FPCA to Category 1.

If an absentee ballot was rejected by an election judge or an Absentee Ballot Board due to a signature mismatch and the signatures do look different, place the ballot in category five **if the transaction was actually handled at your in-person counter and was witnessed by a county or city official.**

If an absentee ballot was rejected because there was no voter signature on the application, the ballot should be placed in category 2 **unless the transaction was once again handled at your in-person counter and was witnessed by a county or city official.**

When checking the registration status of an Absentee Ballot that was rejected for lack of an SVRS Card in the envelope, you should check either the roster and/or the SVRS system to make sure the person was definitely not registered before assigning the ballot to category 3. The person may have been accidentally sent a non-registered Absentee Ballot package even though he or she was registered.

CONTRACT FOR PAYMENT

I have attached a Joint Powers Contract that you can begin processing so you are able to be reimbursed for a portion of your costs. I have also attached the most up-to-date list of counties and cities that have thus far agreed to assist us with this task. If you are still considering my request, please agree to help us one more time with the Canvass of the U.S. Senate Race.

PLEASE FORWARD THIS TO ANYONE WHO SHOULD BE ON THIS DISTRIBUTION LIST WHO IS NOT CURRENTLY FOUND ON IT!

My best regards.

Sincerely,

Jim Gelbmann
Deputy Secretary of State
(651) 201-1344 (office)
(651) 334-4077 (cell)
(651) 739-5575 (home)
(651) 215-0682 (fax)

NOTICE: E-mail correspondence to and from the Office of the Secretary of State of Minnesota may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties

County 2008 Rejected Absentee Ballot Survey Worksheet

This survey requests statistics on rejected absentee ballots for the November 4, 2008 General Election and includes both regular (non-UOCAVA) and UOCAVA absentee ballots.

1. ★County or Municipality Name

City of Minnetrista

2. ★Name of Primary Election Official

Terri Haarstad, City Clerk

3. ★Names of election judges and/or professional election staff who assisted with the sorting process.

Judy Lewman
Char Schmuck

NUMBERS OF REJECTED ABSENTEE BALLOTS

Enter the number of rejected regular (non-UOCAVA) and UOCAVA absentee ballots for each of the categories listed below. If there are no rejected absentee ballots for a particular category enter 0.

Absentee ballots received after election-day need not be included in this sorting process and shall not be reported as part of any of the five categories.

Regular (non-UOCAVA) Absentee Ballots Rejected

4. Category 1: Voter's name / address did not match.

0

5. Category 2: Voter's signature did not match or certification was not filled out correctly.

9

6. Category 3: Voter was not registered at this address or has not included a properly completed voter registration application Or Voter died before Election Day.

4

7. Category 3a: Voter was not registered. VRA appears to be in secrecy envelope.

0

8. Category 4: Voter had already voted at the election.

2

9. Category 5: Enter the number for improperly rejected envelope (including non-UOCAVA ballots, UOCAVA ballots rejected in the precinct, and mail ballots).

The Election Judges did not agree on whether these should have been rejected but agreed they could be placed in this pile to be considered. There were three in this category.

With the first, the mother admitted to completing the application for the child. She brought in personal papers with the voter signature but as there was no proof the voter was the signer of personal papers and the signature on the application did not match the ballot envelope signature, the ballot was rejected on election day. Today's Election Judges decided to place it in pile 5 as the OSS directions for this review process indicated that alternative signatures/proof of voter identity may be acceptable.

With the second, the voter used neat, loopy penmanship to sign the application and used a nearly illegible scrawl to sign the ballot envelope. As such, the signature on the application was determined to not match the signature on the ballot and it was rejected election day. Today's election judges thought that perhaps the neat, loopy signature was an electronic signature and, as the legality of using an electronic signature on election materials was unclear, they decided to place the ballot in this pile.

With the third, there was no application found for the voter. There was an application for the husband for which a ballot was issued and not returned. However, it is not clear if the voter used the husband's ballot or if an election official erred and issued the ballot without an application originally. As there was no application in existence to compare signatures, the ballot was rejected election day. However, today's election judges agreed that it may not be the fault of the voter that there is no application and decided to place it in this pile.

UOCAVA Ballots Rejected by Absentee Ballot Board

10. Category 1: Voter's name did not match.

0

11. Category 2: Voter did not sign oath.

0

12. Category 3: Voter's ID number did not match, and the Election Judges could not otherwise satisfy themselves that the ballot was filled out by the voter to whom it was transmitted.

0

13. Category 4: The voter already voted at that election OR voter died prior to November 4.

0

14. Category 5: Improperly rejected absentee ballot envelopes.

0

Optional: Mail Ballots

15. Number of properly rejected ballots from mail balloting precincts.

Not Applicable

16. Number of mistakenly rejected ballots from mail balloting precincts. (Add this number to the number in Category five for non-UOCAVA ballots.)

Not Applicable

17. **Category 6:** Number of ballots rejected for not meeting MS § 203B.08 Subd. 4 deferring to the rules set by the OSS in regards to the timeliness of the return of absentee ballots and MR 8210.2200 Subp. 1 (Absentee ballot return envelopes that are delivered in person by an absent voter must be received by the county auditor or municipal clerk by 5:00pm on the day before election day); for not meeting MS § 203B.08 Subd. 1 (If delivered in person by an agent, the return envelope must be submitted to the county auditor or municipal clerk by 3:00pm on election day) and MR 8210.2200 Subp. 1 (Absentee ballot return envelopes that are delivered in person by an agent must be received by the county auditor or municipal clerk by 3:00pm on election day); or for not meeting MS § 203B.08 Subd. 4 deferring to the rules set by the OSS in regards to the timeliness of the return of absentee ballots and MR 8210.2500 (The municipal clerk shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that all return envelopes received by the post office before 4:00pm on election day are delivered before the closing of the polls to the election judges in the precinct where the absent voter resides.)

3

18. **Category 7:** Ballots received after Election Day

1

19. **Category 8:** Ballots rejected because of issues with witnesses (Witness missing, improper witness or out-of-state witness) in accordance with MS§ 203B.07 subd. 3.

3