

It is curious that the press chooses to focus on the smoke and not the fire. But since the smoke is at issue---I'll add a few more thoughts about the smoke and then suggest a look at the fire.

SMOKE:

If discussions held with 2 commissioners without the knowledge of the other are theoretically "secret, illegal" and suspect, the meetings I had with Koch and Miliias (without Bryan's knowledge) should also be disclosed. Although I have mentioned these to the press, they don't get reported. In March and April I met at least 3 times (possibly more) in Koch's office with Miliias. Bryan was likely UNAWARE of our meetings where we talked about IRV process, voter education, early voting, and a variety of election process topics. I'm guessing that the topics in those "secret" meetings in City Hall were more substantive regarding the election process than the topics over the election night dinner Miliias and Bryan shared. Or their subsequent meeting where apparently the topic was how to encourage Koch to call another public meeting of the Commission, after earlier attempts had failed.

One has to wonder how Koch and the press can be criticizing the other two for meeting without her, while she held even more so called "secret, non-compliant" meetings with Miliias without Bryan. This shows the level of absurdity and bias that some are reaching in order to discredit the Election Commission which has considerable outstanding business of complex problems not addressed. (They addressed the easy one---mine.)

Of course there was nothing substantively wrong with such "meetings" where Koch, Miliias talked through the complexities of election issues in Koch's office. Nor when the two of them met with me to discuss issues. Were there any substantive decisions made at any of these meetings? Not to my knowledge. These were healthy, informative discussions about election process, hardly "secret, illicit, conspiratorial" meetings! All substantive actions taken by EC have been unanimous.

FIRE:

Why isn't the press (and the Election Commission for that matter) focused on the following substantive issues?

--The identity of many voters can be determined, likely making this election unconstitutional. And quite disturbing to those whose votes are can be determined.

--IRV as Aspen conducts it is in conflict with our Aspen Charter and the CO law.

--The City issued a false report claiming a "staff audit of the IRV process" and a "manual verification of all rankings." Both claims were fabricated. No audit, no manual verification.

--The software was not adequately tested, resulting in two election eve erroneous software changes, one hidden from the public until after the contest period was closed.

--Aspen voters approved a Charter change in 2007 requiring a majority of votes cast to elect mayor and Council members. IRV defied that rule and while Ireland did get over 50%, neither Johnson nor Torre did, as the law required.

--1/3 of the ballots were left in an unlocked ballot box.

-Why is there so much resistance to an examination of the election and so much effort to discredit those asking questions?

-Why have Ireland and some CC members continued to claim that this examination is for overturning the May results, when the deadline passed long ago, and my filing with the court specifically states that a voiding of the election is NOT desired? (Everyone knows that a plaintiff doesn't fib to the court.)

These are but a few of the considerable significant problems with the election--an election that needs to be examined by experts, to present findings for the City to address for future elections.

For more information see <http://theredant.squarespace.com/red-ant-blog/2009/10/25/aspen-may-2009-election-matters.html>

Marilyn Marks